THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London

GURNEY WOODSTOCK S.T.W.

FIDE SED CUI VIDE
1897
EX LIBRIS
HUBERT . BEAUMONT .

616960

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

6 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TO THE SECOND DAY OF MARCH 1906.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION.

1906.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Chronology of "The Parliamentary Debates."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Will. IV.......1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 Will. IV. 1832
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 Will. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 Will. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 Victoria 1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — 1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — 1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 59 .... 4 Victoria (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — 1842
— 66 — 71... 6 — 1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — 1844
— 77 — 82... 8 — 1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — 1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 95 ... .10 Victoria (b) 1847
96 to 101...11 — 1848
— 102 —107...12 — 1849
— 108 —113...13 — 1850
— 114 —118...14 — 1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 123 ....15 Victoria (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — 1853
— 130 —135...17 — 1854
— 136 —139...18 — 1855
— 140 —143...19 — 1856
— 144 ....20 — (a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol. 145 to 147...20 Victoria (b) 1857
— 148 —151...21 — 1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 Victoria (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — 1860
— 161 —164...24 — 1861
— 165 —168...25 — 1862
— 169 —172...26 — 1863
— 173 —176...27 — 1864
— 177 —180...28 — 1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 Victoria...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — 1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 Victoria ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — 1870
— 204 —208...34 — 1871
— 209 —213...35 — 1872
— 214 —217...36 — 1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 Victoria 1874
— 222 —226...38 — 1875
— 227 —231...39 — 1876
— 232 —236...40 — 1877
— 237 —242...41 — 1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 Victoria (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — 1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — 1883
— 284 —292...47 — 1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 Victoria (a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 Victoria (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — 1887
— 322 —332...51 — 1888
— 333 —340...52 — 1889
— 341 —348...53 — 1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152	6	EDWARD VII.	1906

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Office.	Old Ministry.	New Ministry.
Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury	Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, M.P.	Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman
Lord President of the Council	Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry	Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe
Lord Chancellor	Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury	Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn
Chancellor of the Exchequer...	Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.	Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State—		
Home Department ...	Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.	Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
Foreign Affairs	Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne	Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
Colonial Office	Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.	Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin
War Office	Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.	Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
India Office...	Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick, M.P.	Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty ...	Rt. Hon. Earl Cawdor	Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth
Lord Chancellor of Ireland ...	Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne	Not in the Cabinet
Chief Secretary for Ireland ...	Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.	Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal...	Most Hon. Marquess of Salisbury	Most Hon. Marquess of Ripon
President of the Board of Education	Most Hon. Marquess of Londonderry	Rt. Hon. A Birrell, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade	Most Hon. Marquess of Salisbury	Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board	Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour, M.P.	Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture	Rt. Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.	Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington
Postmaster-General	Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.	Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Not in the Cabinet	Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland ...	Most Noble the Marquess of Linlithgow	Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Office.	Old Ministry.	New Ministry.
Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office	Earl PERCY, M.P.	Lord FITZMAURICE
Under Secretary of State, Home Office	Hon. T. H. COCHRANE, M.P.	HERBERT SAMUEL, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office	His Grace the Duke of MARLBOROUGH	WINSTON CHURCHILL, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office	Most Noble the Marquess of BATH	Rt. Hon. J. E. ELLIS, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office	Rt. Hon. Earl of DONOUGHMORE	Rt. Hon. Earl of PORTSMOUTH
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury	Rt. Hon. Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Bt., M.P.	GEORGE WHITELEY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education	Sir W. ANSON, Bt., M.P.	THOMAS LOUGH, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty	E. G. PRETYMAN, M.P.	Rt. Hon. E. ROBERTSON, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade	A. BONAR LAW, Esq., M.P.	H. E. KEARLEY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board	A. F. JEFFREYS, Esq., M.P.	WALTER RUNCIMAN, Esq. M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury	VICTOR CAVENDISH, Esq., M.P.	REGINALD MCKENNA, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office	W. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT, Esq., M.P.	T. R. BUCHANAN, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury ...	Lord BALCARRES, M.P. H. W. FORSTER, Esq., M.P. Lord Edmund TALBOT, M.P.	J. A. PEASE, Esq., M.P. HERBERT LEWIS, Esq., M.P. Captain CECIL NORTON, M.P. J. M. F. FULLER, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty ...	Admiral Sir JOHN FISHER Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. DRURY Rear-Admiral W. H. MAY Captain F. G. INGLEFIELD	Admiral Sir JOHN FISHER Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. DRURY Captain H. B. JACKSON Captain F. S. INGLEFIELD
Army Council	The Secretary of State for War (*in the Cabinet*) Lieut.-General Hon. Sir W. G. LYTTELTON Lieut.-General C. W. H. DOUGLAS Major-General H. C. O. PLUMER Major-General Sir J. W. MURRAY The Under Secretary of State for War The Financial Secretary to the War Office *Secretary.* The Permanant Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. WARD)	The Secretary of State for War (*in the Cabinet*) Lieut.-General Hon. Sir W. G. LYTTELTON Lieut.-General C. W. H. DOUGLAS Lieut.-General Sir W. G. NICHOLSON Major-General Sir J. W. MURRAY The Under Secretary of State for War The Financial Secretary to the War Office *Secretary.* The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. WARD)
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty	ARTHUR LEE, Esq., M.P.	GEORGE LAMBERT, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland ...	Rt. Hon. Earl of DUDLEY	Rt. Hon. the Earl of ABERDEEN
The Lord Advocate	A. GRAHAM-MURRAY, Esq., M.P.	THOMAS SHAW, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Sir W. H. WALROND, M.P.	In the Cabinet
Attorney-General	Sir ROBERT FINLAY, M.P.	J. LAWSON WALTON, Esq., M.P.
Solicitor-General	Sir EDWARD CARSON, M.P.	W. S. ROBSON, Esq., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——T. Milvain, Esq., K.C.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount Althorp.
Vice-Chamberlain——Wentworth Beaumont, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Liverpool.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of Sefton.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of Elibank, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir Edward Strachey, Bt., M.P.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of Manchester.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl Granville.
- Earl of Granard.
- Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.
- Lord Acton.
- Lord Denman.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. John Sinclair.
Lord High Constable——Earl of Errol.
Lord Privy Seal——
Master of the Household——Duke of Argyll, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord Justice General——
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Solicitor-General——Alexander Ure, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir Stair Agnew, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. Leach, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of Aberdeen.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. Macdonnell, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretary——Walter Callan, Esq.
State Steward——Lord Lurgan, K.C.V.O.
Controller——Major Lambart.
Chamberlain——Victor G. S. Corkran, Esq., C.V.O.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice Walker.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry, K.C.
Solicitor-General——Redmond Barry, Esq., K.C.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord Grenfell, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. N. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart., S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.
Junior Clerks——B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.; W. P. Johnston, Esq.; J. Barlow, Esq.; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. FRENCH.
Messenger——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART ; Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON,
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

AN ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

6 EDWARD VII. 1906.

NOTE.—*The Figures in the Margin refer to the corresponding Figures on the Roll.*

A

36	Abercorn, James Marquess of. (*Duke of Abercorn*)
353	Abercromby, George Ralph Lord
472	Aberdare, Henry Campbell Lord
49	Abergavenny, William Marquess of
73	Abingdon, Montagu Arthur Earl of
401	Abinger, Shelley Leopold Laurence Lord
465	Acton, Richard Maximilian Lord
535	Addington, Egerton Lord
44	Ailesbury, Henry Augustus Marquess of
46	Ailsa, Archibald Marquess of
3	Albany, His Royal Highness Leopold Charles Edward George Albert Duke of
75	Albemarle, Arnold Allan Cecil Earl of
564	Aldenham, Henry Hucks Lord
482	Alington, Humphrey Napier Lord
592	Allerton, William Lawies Lord
199 & 240	Althorp, Charles Robert Viscount. (*Lord Chamberlain of the Household*)
589	Alverstone, Richard Everard Lord
156	Amherst, William Archer Earl
544	Amherst of Hackney, William Amhurst Lord
494	Ampthill, Arthur Oliver Villiers Lord
190	Ancaster, Gilbert Henry Earl of
42	Anglesey, Charles Henry Alexander Marquess of
444	Annaly, Luke Lord
122	Annesley, Hugh Earl. (*Elected for Ireland*)
490	Ardilaun, Arthur Edward Lord
30	Argyll, John Douglas Sutherland Duke of
600	Armstrong, William Henry Armstrong FitzPatrick Lord
285	Arundell of Wardour, John Francis Lord
512	Ashbourne, Edward Lord
96	Ashburnham, Bertram Earl of
403	Ashburton, Francis Denzil Edward Lord
541	Ashcombe, George Lord
559	Ashton, James Lord

603 Atkinson, John Lord. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)
329 Auckland, William Morton Lord
585 Avebury, John Lord
91 Aylesford, Charles Wightwick Earl of

B

314 Bagot, William Lord
461 Balinhard, Charles Noel Lord. (*Earl of Southesk*)
298 Balfour of Burley, Alexander Hugh Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
126 Bandon, James Francis Earl of (*Elected for Ireland*)
208 Bangor, Henry William Crosbie Viscount. (*Elected for Ireland*)
263 Bangor, Watkin Herbert Bishop of
293 Barnard, Henry de Vere Lord
593 Barrymore, Arthur Hugh Lord
532 Basing, George Limbrey Lord
409 Bateman, William Spencer Lord
35 Bath, Thomas Henry Marquess of
255 Bath and Wells, George Wyndham Bishop of
108 Bathurst, Seymour Henry Earl
549 Battersea, Cyril Lord
149 Beauchamp, William Earl
13 Beaufort, Henry Adelbert Wellington Fitzroy Duke of
16 Bedford, Herbrand Arthur Duke of
299 Belhaven and Stenton, Alexander Charles Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
426 Bellew, Charles Bertram Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
125 Belmore, Somerset Richard Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
432 Belper, Henry Lord
72 Berkeley, Randal Mowbray Thomas Earl of
319 Berwick, Richard Henry Lord
598 Biddulph, Michael Lord
266 Birmingham, Charles Bishop of.
542 Blythswood, Archibald Campbell Lord
202 Bolingbroke and St. John, ——— Viscount
337 Bolton, William Thomas Lord
296 Borthwick, Archibald Patrick Thomas Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
306 Boston, George Florance Lord
274 Botreaux, Charles Edward Hastings Lord. (*Earl of Loudoun*)
528 Bowes, Claude George Lord. (*Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn*)
300 Boyle, Charles Spencer Canning Lord. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery*)
493 Brabourne, Edward Lord
148 Bradford, George Cecil Orlando Earl of
581 Brampton, Henry Lord
452 Brancepeth, Gustavus Russell Lord. (*Viscount Boyne*)
20 Brandon, Alfred Douglas Duke of
525 Brassey, Thomas Lord
325 Braybrooke, Henry Lord
279 Braye, Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord
50 Breadalbane, Gavin Marquess of
223 Bridport, Arthur Wellington Alexander Nelson Viscount
45 Bristol, Frederick William John Marquess of
261 Bristol, George Forrest Bishop of
334 Brodrick, William Lord. (*Viscount Midleton*)
99 Brooke, Francis Richard Charles Guy Earl, and Earl of Warwick
440 Brougham and Vaux, Henry Charles Lord
145 Brownlow, Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl
100 Buckinghamshire, Sidney Carr Earl of
560 Burghclere, Herbert Coulstoun Lord
597 Burnham, Edward Levy Lord
523 Burton, Michael Arthur Lord
38 Bute, John Marquess of
289 Byron, George Frederick William Lord

C

116 Cadogan, George Henry Earl
182 Cairns, Wilfred Dallas Earl
335 Calthorpe, Augustus Cholmondeley Lord
41 Camden, John Charles Marquess
275 Camoys, Ralph Francis Julian Lord
159 Camperdown, Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of

4 Canterbury, Randall Thomas Archbishop of

218 Canterbury, Henry Charles Viscount

412 Carew, Robert Shapland George Julian Lord

322 Carleton, Richard Henry Lord. (*Earl of Shannon*)

69 Carlisle, George James Earl of

115 Carnarvon, George Edward Stanhope Molyneux Earl of

84 Carnwath, Robert Harris Carnwath Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)

191 Carrington, Charles Robert Earl

352 Carysfort, William Lord. (*Earl of Carysfort*)

362 Castlemaine, Albert Edward Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

464 Castletown, Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord

143 Cathcart, Alan Earl

157 Cawdor, Frederick Archibald Vaughan Earl

393 Chaworth, Reginald Lord. (*Earl of Meath*)

436 Chelmsford, Frederic John Napier Lord

435 Chesham, Charles Compton William Lord

250 Chester, Francis John Bishop of

66 Chesterfield, Edwyn Francis Earl of

534 Cheylesmore, Herbert Francis Lord

131 Chichester, Jocelyn Brudenell Earl of

246 Chichester, Ernest Roland Bishop of

43 Cholmondeley, George Henry Hugh Marquess of

236 Churchill, Victor Albert Francis Charles Viscount

437 Churston, John Lord

216 Clancarty, William Frederick Viscount. (*Earl of Clancarty*)

386 Clanwilliam, Richard James Lord. (*Earl of Clanwilliam*)

110 Clarendon, Edward Hyde Earl of

391 Clements, Charles Lord. (*Earl of Leitrim*)

291 Clifford of Chudleigh, Lewis Henry Hugh Lord

271 Clinton, Charles John Robert Lord

345 Clonbrock, Luke Gerald Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

398 Cloncurry, Valentine Frederick Lord

203 Cobham, Charles George Viscount

367 Colchester, Reginald Charles Edward Lord

474 Coleridge, Bernard John Seymour Lord

235 Colville of Culross, Charles Robert William Viscount

217 Combermere, Francis Lynch Wellington Viscount

425 Congleton, Henry Lord

2 Connaught and Strathearn, His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of

172 Cottenham, Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of

476 Cottesloe, Thomas Francis Lord

76 Coventry, George William Earl of

173 Cowley, Henry Arthur Mornington Earl

189 Cranbrook, Gathorne Earl of

582 Cranworth, Bertram Francis Lord

128 Craven, William George Robert Earl of

543 Crawshaw, Thomas Lord

7 & 192 Crewe, Robert Offley Ashburton Earl of. (*Lord President of the Council.*)

347 Crofton, Edward Henry Churchill Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

196 Cromer, Evelyn Earl of

227 Cross, Richard Assheton Viscount

25 Cumberland and Teviotdale, His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Fredk. Duke of

579 Currie, Philip Henry Wodehouse Lord

D

120 Darnley, Ivo Francis Walter Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)

89 Dartmouth, William Heneage Earl of

178 Dartrey, Vesey Earl of

556 Davey, Horace Lord. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

570 Dawnay, Hugh Richard Lord. (*Viscount Downe*)

270 de Clifford, Jack Southwell Lord

428 De Freyne, Arthur Lord

105	De La Warr, Gilbert Geo. Reginald Earl
402	De L'Isle and Dudley, Philip Lord
413	De Mauley, William Ashley Webb Lord
533	De Ramsey, William Henry Lord
267	de Ros, Dudley Charles Lord
399	de Saumarez, James St. Vincent Lord
375	Delamere, Hugh Lord
61	Denbigh, Rudolph Robert Basil Aloysius Augustine Earl of
400	Denman, Thomas Lord
514	Deramore, Robert Wilfrid Lord
56	Derby, Frederick Arthur Earl of
498	Derwent, Harcourt Lord
611	Desborough, William Henry Lord
59	Devon, Charles Pepys Earl of
17	Devonshire, Spencer Compton Duke of
309	Digby, Edward Henry Trafalgar Lord
312	Dinevor, Arthur de Cardonnel Lord
70	Doncaster, William Henry Walter Earl of. (*Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry*)
286	Dormer, Ronald John Lord
478	Douglas, Charles Alexander Lord. (*Earl of Home*)
119	Drogheda, Ponsonby William Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
164	Ducie, Henry John Earl of
175	Dudley, William Humble Earl of
51	Dufferin and Ava, Terence John Temple Marquess of
350	Dunalley, Henry O'Callaghan Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
340	Dunboyne, Robert St. John Fitz-Walter Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
87	Dundonald, Douglas Mackinnon Baillie Hamilton Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
601	Dunedin, Andrew Graham Lord.
546	Dunleath, Henry Lyle Lord
394	Dunmore, Charles Adolphus Lord. (*Earl of Dunmore*)
460	Dunning, John Lord. (*Lord Rollo*)
161	Durham, John George Earl of
244	Durham, Handley Carr Glyn Bishop of

E

434	Ebury, Robert Wellesley Lord
163	Effingham, Henry Alexander Gordon Earl of
193	Egerton, Wilbraham Earl
150	Eldon, John Earl of
427	Elgin, Victor Alexander Lord. (*Earl of Elgin and Kincardine*)
354	Ellenborough, Edward Downes Lord
170	Ellesmere, Francis Charles Granville Earl of
516	Elphinstone, Sidney Herbert Lord
475	Emly, Thomas William Gaston Lord
357	Erskine, William Macnaghten Lord
231	Esher, Reginald Baliol Viscount
68	Essex, George Devereux de Vere Earl of
599	Estcourt, George Thomas John Lord
470	Ettrick, William John George Lord (*Lord Napier*)
39	Exeter, William Thomas Brownlow Marquess of
214	Exmouth, Edward Addington Hargreaves Viscount

F

610	Faber, Edmund Beckett Lord
569	Fairlie, David Lord. (*Earl of Glasgow*)
201	Falkland, Byron Plantagenet Viscount. (*Elected for Scotland*)
204	Falmouth, Evelyn Edward Thomas Viscount
576	Farquhar, Horace Brand Lord
551	Farrer, Thomas Cecil Lord
480	Fermanagh, John Henry Lord. (*Earl Erne*)
88	Ferrers, Sewallis Edward Earl
179	Feversham, William Ernest Earl of
537	Field, William Ventris Lord
29	Fife, Alexander William George Duke of
389	Fingall, Arthur James Francis Lord. (*Earl of Fingall*)
326	Fisherwick, Edward Arthur Donald St. George Hamilton Lord. (*Marquess of Donegall*)
443	Fitzhardinge, Charles Paget Fitzhardinge Lord

613	Fitzmaurice, Edmond George Petty Lord
101	Fitzwilliam, William Charles De Meuron Earl
311	Foley, Fitzalan Charles John Lord
376	Forester, Cecil Theodore Lord
116	Fortescue, Hugh Earl
365	Foxford, William Henry Edmond de Vere Sheaffe Lord. (*Earl of Limerick*)

G

327	Gage, Henry Charles Lord. (*Viscount Gage*)
169	Gainsborough, Charles William Francis Earl of
360	Gardner, ——— Lord
484	Gerard, Frederic John Lord
378	Gifford, Edric Frederic Lord
580	Glanusk, Joseph Henry Russell Lord
563	Glenesk, Algernon Lord
213	Gordon, John Campbell Viscount. (*Earl of Aberdeen*)
457	Gormanston, Jenico William Joseph Lord. (*Viscount Gormanston*)
232	Goschen, George Joachim Viscount
221	Gough, Hugh Viscount
12	Grafton, Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of
94	Graham, Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl. (*Duke of Montrose*)
359	Granard, Bernard Arthur William Patrick Hastings Lord. (*Earl of Granard*)
316	Grantley, John Richard Brinsley Lord
162	Granville, Granville George Earl
594	Grenfell, Francis Wallace Lord
467	Greville, Algernon William Fulke Lord
138	Grey, Albert Henry George Earl
273	Grey de Ruthyn, Rawdon George Grey Lord
520	Grimthorpe, Edmund William Lord
364	Grinstead, Lowry Egerton Lord (*Earl of Enniskillen*)
102	Guilford, Frederick George Earl of
336	Gwydir, Peter Robert Lord

H

82	Haddington, George Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
488	Haldon, Lawrence William Lord
578	Haliburton, Arthur Lawrence Lord
222	Halifax, Charles Lindley Viscount
194	Halsbury, Hardinge Stanley Earl of
524	Hamilton of Dalzell, Gavin George Lord
225	Hampden, Henry Robert Viscount
477	Hampton, Herbert Perrott Murray Lord
220	Hardinge, Henry Charles Viscount
103	Hardwicke, John Manners Earl of
462	Hare William Lord. (*Earl of Listowel*)
141	Harewood, Henry Ulick Earl of
481	Harlech, George Ralph Charles Lord
97	Harrington, Charles Augustus Earl of
366	Harris, George Robert Canning Lord
140	Harrowby, John Herbert Dudley Earl of
449	Hartismere, Charles Henry Chandos Lord. (*Lord Henniker*)
269	Hastings, Albert Edward Delaval Lord
404	Hatherton, Edward George Percy Lord
615	Haversham, Arthur Divett Lord
310	Hawke, Martin Bladen Lord
301	Hay, Archibald Fitzroy George Lord. (*Earl of Kinnoul*)
346	Headley, Charles Mark Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
616	Hemphill, Charles Hare Lord
565	Heneage, Edward Lord
200	Hereford, Robert Viscount
256	Hereford, John Bishop of
506	Herries, Marmaduke Francis Lord
517	Herschell, Richard Farrer Lord
37	Hertford, Hugh de Grey Marquess of
384	Heytesbury, Leonard Lord
219	Hill, Rowland Richard Viscount
518	Hillingdon, Charles William Lord
109	Hillsborough, Arthur Wills John Wellington Trumbull Blundell Earl of. (*Marquess of Downshire*)

519 Hindlip, Charles Lord

572 Holm Patrick, Hans Wellesley Lord

207 Hood, Francis Wheler Viscount

499 Hothfield, Henry James Lord

463 Howard of Glossop, Francis Edward Lord

282 Howard de Walden, Thomas Evelyn Lord

151 Howe, Richard George Penn Earl

496 Howth, William Ulick Tristram Lord. (*Earl of Howth*)

57 Huntingdon, Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of

215 Hutchinson, Richard Walter John Viscount. (*Earl of Donoughmore*)

450 Hylton, Hylton George Hylton Lord

I

187 Iddesleigh, Walter Stafford Earl of

104 Ilchester, Giles Stephen Holland Earl of

341 Inchiquin, Lucius William Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

166 Innes, Henry John Earl. (*Duke of Roxburghe*)

573 Inverclyde, James Cleland Lord

239 Iveagh, Edward Cecil Viscount

J

561 James, Henry Lord

77 Jersey, Victor Albert George Earl of

617 Joicey, James Lord

K

540 Kelvin, William Lord

392 Kenlis, Geoffrey Thomas Lord. (*Marquess of Headfort*)

431 Kenmare, Valentine Charles Lord. (*Earl of Kenmare*)

447 Kenry, Windham Thomas Lord. (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*)

522 Kensington, Hugh Lord

324 Kenyon, Lloyd Lord

368 Ker, Robert Schomberg Lord. (*Marquess of Lothian*)

453 Kesteven, John Henry Lord

587 Killanin, Martin Henry Lord

344 Kilmaine, Francis William Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

388 Kilmarnock, Charles Gore Lord. (*Earl of Erroll*)

154 Kilmorey, Francis Charles Earl of (*Elected for Ireland*)

177 Kimberley, John Earl of

441 Kinnaird, Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord

567 Kinnear, Alexander Smith Lord

590 Kinross, Patrick Lord

410 Kintore, Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord. (*Earl of Kintore*)

234 Kitchener of Khartoum and of the Vaal, Horatio Herbert Viscount

607 Knaresborough, Henry Meysey Lord

595 Knollys, Francis Lord

229 Knutsford, Henry Thurstan Viscount

L

491 Lamington, Charles Wallace Alexander Napier Lord

348 Langford, Hercules Edward Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

32 Lansdowne, Henry Charles Keith Marquess of

184 Lathom, Edward George Earl of

83 Lauderdale, Frederick Henry Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)

459 Lawrence, John Hamilton Lord

438 Leconfield, Charles Henry Lord

15 Leeds, George Godolphin Duke of

167 Leicester, Thomas William Earl of

418 Leigh, William Dudley Lord

206 Leinster, Maurice Viscount. (*Duke of Leinster*)

602 Leith of Fyvie, Alexander John Lord

85 Leven and Melville, Ronald Ruthven Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)

160 Lichfield, Thomas Francis Earl of

253 Lichfield, Augustus Bishop of

338 Lilford, John Lord

248 Lincoln, Edward Bishop of

586 Lindley, Nathaniel Lord

63 Lindsey, Montague Peregrine Albemarle Earl of

53 Linlithgow, John Adrian Louis Marquess of

568 Lister, Joseph Lord

54 & 198	Liverpool Cecil George Savile Earl of. (*Lord Steward of the Household*)
264	Liverpool, Francis James Bishop of
230	Llandaff, Henry Viscount
547	Llangattock, John Allan Lord
557	Loch, Edward Douglas Lord
351	Loftus, John Henry Lord. (*Marquess of Ely*)
188	Londesborough, William Francis Henry Earl of
243	London, Arthur Foley Bishop of
139	Lonsdale, Hugh Cecil Earl of
5 & 612	Loreburn, Robert Threshie Lord. (*Lord High Chancellor*)
408	Lovat, Simon Joseph Lord
168	Lovelace, Ralph Gordon Earl of
307	Lovel and Holland, Augustus Arthur Lord. (*Earl of Egmont*)
124	Lucan, George Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
290	Lucas, ——— Lord
571	Ludlow, Henry Ludlow Lord
420	Lurgan, William Lord
183	Lytton, Victor Alexander George Robert Earl of
439	Lyveden, Courtenay Robert Percy Lord

M

93	Macclesfield, George Loveden William Henry Earl of
527	Macnaghten, Edward Lord. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)
531	Magheramorne, Dudley Stuart Lord
117	Malmesbury, James Edward Earl of
22	Manchester, William Angus Drogo Duke of
292	Manners of Haddon, Henry John Brinsley Lord. (*Marquess of Granby*)
361	Manners, John Thomas Lord
111	Mansfield, William David Earl of
136	Manvers, Charles William Sydney Earl
79	Mar, John Francis Erskine Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
81	Mar and Kellie, Walter John Francis Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
18	Marlborough, Charles Richard John Duke of
539	Masham, Samuel Lord
342	Massy, John Thomas William Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
121	Mayo, Dermot Robert Wyndham Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
363	Meldrum, Charles Lord. (*Marquess of Huntly*)
210	Melville, Charles Saunders Viscount
330	Mendip, Thomas Charles Lord. (*Viscount Clifden*)
446	Meredyth, James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord. (*Lord Athlumney*)
416	Methuen, Paul Sanford Lord
609	Michelham, Herbert Lord
302	Middleton, Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord
237	Milner, Alfred Viscount
369	Minster, Victor George Henry Francis Lord. (*Marquess Conyngham*)
142	Minto, Gilbert John Earl of
448	Monck, Henry Power Charles Stanley Lord. (*Viscount Monck*)
529	Monckton, George Edmund Milnes Lord. (*Viscount Galway*)
473	Moncreiff, Henry James Lord
503	Monk Bretton, John William Lord
511	Monkswell, Robert Lord
303	Monson, Augustus Debonnaire John Lord
515	Montagu of Beaulieu, John Walter Edward Lord
358	Monteagle, Henry Ulick Lord. (*Marquess of Sligo*)
421	Monteagle of Brandon, Thomas Spring Lord
147	Morley, Edmund Robert Earl of
80	Morton, Sholto George Watson Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
396	Mostyn, Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord
113	Mount Edgcumbe, William Henry Earl of
538	Mount Stephen, George Lord
268	Mowbray, Charles Botolph Joseph Lord
577	Muncaster, Josslyn Francis Lord
158	Munster, Aubrey Earl of

343 Muskerry, Hamilton Matthew Fitzmaurice Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)

N

456 Napier, Robert William Lord
134 Nelson, Horatio Earl
23 Newcastle, Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of
575 Newlands, James Henry Cecil Lord
545 Newton, Thomas Wodehouse Lord
9 Norfolk, Henry Duke of. (*Earl Marshal of England*)
47 Normanby, Constantine Charles Henry Marquess of
280 North, William Henry John Lord
40 Northampton, William George Spencer Scott Marquess of
504 Northbourne, Walter Henry Lord
181 Northbrook, Francis George Earl of
608 Northcliffe, Alfred Charles William Lord
584 Northcote, Henry Stafford Lord
87 Northesk, David John Earl of. (*Elected for Scotland*)
508 Northington, Frederic Lord. (*Lord Henley*)
24 Northumberland, Henry George Duke of
486 Norton, Charles Leigh Lord
254 Norwich, John Bishop of
618 Nunburnholme, Charles Henry Lord

O

588 O'Brien, Peter Lord
468 O'Hagan, Maurice Herbert Ignatius Towneley Lord
455 O'Neill, Edward Lord
129 Onslow, William Hillier Earl of
407 Oranmore and Browne, Geoffrey Henry Browne Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
137 Orford, Robert Horace Earl of
373 Oriel, Algernon William John Clotworthy Lord. (*Viscount Massereene*)
454 Ormathwaite, Arthur Lord
370 Ormonde, James Edward William Theobald Lord. (*Marquess of Ormonde*)
552 Overtoun, John Campbell Lord
423 Oxenfoord, John Hew North Gustave Henry Lord. (*Earl of Stair*)
265 Oxford, Francis Bishop of

P

228 Peel, Arthur Wellesley Viscount
58 Pembroke and Montgomery, Sidney Earl of
451 Penrhyn, George Sholto Gordon Lord
259 Peterborough, Edward Carr Bishop of
283 Petre, Bernard Henry Philip Lord
548 Playfair, George James Lord
383 Plunket, William Lee Lord
197 Plymouth, Robert George Earl of
395 Poltimore, Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord
304 Ponsonby, Walter William Brabazon Lord. (*Earl of Bessborough*)
21 Portland, William John Arthur Charles James Duke of
224 Portman, William Henry Berkeley Viscount
98 Portsmouth, Newton Earl of
78 Poulett, William John Lydston Earl
507 Powerscourt, Mervyn Richard Lord
133 Powis, George Charles Earl of

R

106 Radnor, Jacob Earl of
430 Raglan, George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord
479 Ramsay, Arthur George Maule Lord. (*Earl of Dalhousie*)
381 Ranfurly, Uchter John Mark Lord. (*Earl of Ranfurly*)
458 Rathdonnell, Thomas Kane Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
562 Rathmore, David Robert Lord
374 Ravensworth, Arthur Thomas Lord
377 Rayleigh, John William Lord
497 Reay, Donald James Lord
596 Redesdale, Algernon Bertram Lord
554 Rendel, Stuart Lord
510 Revelstoke, John Lord
339 Ribblesdale, Thomas Lord
11 Richmond and Gordon, Charles Henry Duke of
233 Ridley, Matthew White Viscount

8 & 48 Ripon, George Frederick Samuel Marquess of. (*Lord Privy Seal*)
247 Ripon, William Boyd Bishop of
604 Ritchie, of Dundee, Charles Lord
195 Roberts, Frederick Sleigh Earl
583 Robertson, James Patrick Bannerman Lord. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)
317 Rodney, George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord
445 Romilly, William Gaspard Guy Lord
130 Romney, Charles Earl of
385 Rosebery, Archibald Philip Lord. (*Earl of Rosebery*)
566 Rosmead, Hercules Arthur Temple Lord
135 Rosse, Lawrence Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
127 Rosslyn, James Francis Harry Earl of
411 Rossmore, Derrick Warner William Lord
509 Rothschild, Nathaniel Mayer Lord
176 Russell, John Francis Stanley Earl
19 Rutland, John James Robert Duke of

S

485 Sackville, Lionel Sackville Lord
14 St. Albans, Charles Victor Albert Aubrey De Vere Duke of
258 St. Albans, Edgar, Bishop of
242 St. Aldwyn, Michael Edward Viscount
251 St. Asaph, Alfred George Bishop of
260 St. Davids, John Bishop of
146 Saint Germans, Henry Cornwallis Earl of
281 St. John of Bletso, Beauchamp Moubray Lord
429 Saint Leonards, Edward Burtenshaw Lord
530 Saint Levan, John Lord
513 Saint Oswald, Rowland Lord
209 St. Vincent, Carnegie Parker Viscount
34 Salisbury, James Edward Hubert Marquess of.
249 Salisbury, John Bishop of
333 Saltersford, James George Henry Lord. (*Earl of Courtown*)
294 Saltoun, Alexander William Fredk. Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
605 Sanderson, Thomas Henry Lord
469 Sandhurst, William Lord
67 Sandwich, Edward George Henry Earl of
355 Sandys, Michael Edwin Marcus Lord
536 Savile, John Savile Lord
284 Saye and Sele, John Fiennes Lord
74 Scarbrough, Aldred Fredk. George Beresford Earl of
305 Scarsdale, Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord
422 Seaton, John Reginald Upton Lord
390 Sefton, Osbert Cecil Lord. (*Earl of Sefton*)
186 Selborne, William Waldegrave Earl of
238 Selby, William Court Viscount
71 Shaftesbury, Anthony Earl of
356 Sheffield, Henry North Lord. (*Earl of Sheffield*)
320 Sherborne, Edward Lennox Lord
55 Shrewsbury, Charles Henry John Earl of
487 Shute, Walter Bulkeley Lord. (*Viscount Barrington*)
591 Shuttleworth, Ughtred James Lord
211 Sidmouth, William Wells Viscount
372 Silchester, Thomas Lord. (*Earl of Longford*)
295 Sinclair, Charles William Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
379 Somerhill, Hubert George Lord. (*Marquess of Clanricarde*)
318 Somers, Arthur Herbert Tennyson Lord
10 Somerset, Algernon Duke of
471 Somerton, Sidney James Lord. (*Earl of Normanton*)
185 Sondes, George Edward Earl
315 Southampton, Charles Henry Lord
257 Southwark, Edward Stuart Bishop of
107 Spencer, John Poyntz Earl
288 Stafford, Fitzherbert Lord
521 Stalbridge, Richard de Aquila Lord
64 Stamford, William Earl of

92	Stanhope, Jame Richard Earl
417	Stanley of Alderley, Edward Lyulph Lord
553	Stanmore, Arthur Lord
332	Stewart of Garlies, Randolph Henry Lord. (*Earl of Galloway*)
152	Stradbroke, George Edward John Mowbray Earl of
171	Strafford, Francis Edmund Cecil Earl of
112	Strange, John James Hugh Henry Earl. (*Duke of Atholl*)
574	Strathcona and Mount Royal, Donald Alexander Lord
406	Stratheden, Hallyburton George Lord
502	Strathspey, James Lord. (*Earl of Seafield*)
331	Stuart of Castle Stuart, Francis James Lord. (*Earl of Moray*)
415	Sudeley, Charles Douglas Richard Lord
505	Sudley, Arthur Jocelyn Charles Lord. (*Earl of Arran*)
323	Suffield, Charles Lord
60	Suffolk and Berkshire, Henry Molyneux Paget Earl of
27	Sutherland, Cromartie Duke of
550	Swansea, Ernest Ambrose Lord

T

433	Talbot de Malahide, Richard Wogan Lord
90	Tankerville, George Montagu Earl of
153	Temple of Stowe, Algernon William Stephen Earl
397	Templemore, Henry Spencer Lord
212	Templetown, Henry Edward Montagu Dorington Clotworthy Viscount. (*Elected for Ireland*)
501	Tennyson, Hallam Lord
382	Tenterden, Charles Stuart Henry Lord
287	Teynham, Henry John Philip Sidney Lord
526	Thring, Henry Lord
328	Thurlow, Thomas John Lord
483	Tollemache, Bentley Lyonel John Lord
297	Torphichen, James Walter Lord. (*Elected for Scotland*)
205	Torrington, George Master Viscount
33	Townshend, John James Dudley Stuart Marquess
241	Tredegar, Godfrey Charles Viscount
492	Trevor, Arthur William Lord
252	Truro, John Bishop of
495	Tweeddale, William Montagu Lord. (*Marquess of Tweeddale*)
500	Tweedmouth, Edward Lord
321	Tyrone, Henry De La Poer Lord. (*Marquess of Waterford*)

V

155	Vane, Charles Stewart Earl. (*Marquess of Londonderry*)
277	Vaux of Harrowden, Hubert George Charles Lord
349	Ventry, Dayrolles Blakeney Lord. (*Elected for Ireland*)
308	Vernon, George Francis Augustus Lord
144	Verulam, James Walter Earl of
424	Vivian, George Crespigny Brabazon Lord

W

262	Wakefield, George Rodney Bishop of
95	Waldegrave, William Frederick Earl
606	Waleran, William Hood Lord
1	Wales, His Royal Highness The Prince of
313	Walsingham, Thomas Lord
558	Wandsworth, Sydney James Lord
614	Weardale, Philip James Lord
555	Welby, Reginald Earle Lord
26	Wellington, Arthur Charles Duke of
371	Wemyss, Francis Richard Lord. (*Earl of Wemyss*)
419	Wenlock, Beilby Lord
278	Wentworth, Ralph Gordon Lord (*In another place as Earl of Lovelace*)
442	Westbury, Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord
118	Westmeath, Anthony Francis Earl of. (*Elected for Ireland*)
28	Westminster, Hugh Richard Arthur Duke of

62 Westmorland, Anthony Mildmay Julian Earl of

180 Wharncliffe, Francis John Earl of

123 Wicklow, Ralph Francis Earl of. *(Elected for Ireland)*

380 Wigan, James Ludovic Lord. (*Earl of Crawford*)

276 Willoughby de Broke, Richard Greville Lord

132 Wilton, Arthur George Earl of

489 Wimborne, Ivor Bertie Lord

31 Winchester, Henry William Montagu Marquess of

245 Winchester, Herbert Edward Bishop of

65 Winchilsea and Nottingham, Henry Stormont Earl of

619 Winterstoke, William Henry Lord

174 Winton, George Arnulph Earl of. (*Earl of Eglintoun*)

226 Wolseley, Garnet Joseph Viscount

466 Wolverton, Frederick Lord

405 Worlingham, Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord. (*Earl of Gosford*)

414 Wrottesley, Arthur Lord

387 Wynford, Philip George Lord

Y

165 Yarborough, Chas. Alfred Worsley Earl of

6 York, William Dalrymple Archbishop of

Z

52 Zetland, Lawrence Marquess of

272 Zouche of Haryngworth, Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord

---

The following Lords have Two Numbers, being Twice named in the Roll :

Lord Loreburn, as Lord High Chancellor, and as Lord Loreburn (Nos. 5 and 612)

Earl of Crewe, as Lord President, and as Earl of Crewe (Nos. 7 and 192)

Marquess of Ripon, as Lord Privy Seal, and as Marquess of Ripon (Nos. 8 and 48)

Earl of Liverpool, as Lord Steward, and as Earl of Liverpool (Nos. 54 and 198)

Viscount Althorp, as Lord Chamberlain, and as Viscount Althorp (Nos. 199 and 240)

Earl of Lovelace, as Earl of Lovelace, and as Lord Wentworth (Nos. 168 and 278)

ROLL

OF THE

LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

6 EDWARD VII. 1906.

MEM.—*According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons, the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose, within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.*

---

1 His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales

2 His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearn

3 His Royal Highness Leopold Charles Edward George Albert Duke of Albany

4 Randall Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury

5 Robert Threshie Lord Loreburn *Lord High Chancellor*

6 William Dalrymple Archbishop of York

7 Robert Offley Ashburton Earl of Crewe, *Lord President of the Council.*

8 George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon *Lord Privy Seal.*

9 Henry Duke of Norfolk, *Earl Marshal of England*

10 Algernon Duke of Somerset

11 Charles Henry Duke of Richmond and Gordon

12 Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of Grafton

13 Henry Adelbert Wellington Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort

14 Charles Victor Albert Aubrey de Vere Duke of St. Albans

15 George Godolphin Duke of Leeds

16 Herbrand Arthur Duke of Bedford

17 Spencer Compton Duke of Devonshire.

18 Charles Richard John Duke of Marlborough

19 John James Robert Duke of Rutland

20 Alfred Douglas Duke of Brandon

21 William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland

22 William Angus Drogo Duke of Manchester

23 Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle

24 Henry George Duke of Northumberland

25 His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale

26 Arthur Charles Duke of Wellington

27 Cromartie Duke of Sutherland

28 Hugh Richard Arthur Duke of Westminster

29 Alexander William George Duke of Fife

30 John Douglas Sutherland Duke of Argyll

31 Henry William Montagu Marquess of Winchester

32 Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne

33 John James Dudley Stuart Marquess Townshend

34 James Edward Hubert Marquess Salisbury.

35 Thomas Henry Marquess of Bath

36 James Marquess of Abercorn (*Duke of Abercorn*)

37 Hugh de Grey Marquess of Hertford

38 John Marquess of Bute

39 William Thomas Brownlow Marquess of Exeter

40 William George Spencer Scott Marquess of Northampton

41 John Charles Marquess Camden

42 Charles Henry Alexander Marquess of Anglesey

43 George Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.

44 Henry Augustus Marquess of Ailesbury

45 Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol

46 Archibald Marquess of Ailsa

47 Constantine Charles Henry Marquess of Normanby

48 George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon (*In another place as Lord Privy Seal.*)

49 William Marquess of Abergavenny

50 Gavin Marquess of Breadalbane

51 Terence John Temple Marquess of Dufferin and Ava

52 Lawrence Marquess of Zetland

53 John Adrian Louis Marquess of Linlithgow

54 Cecil George Savile Earl of Liverpool *Lord Steward of the Household.*

55 Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury

56 Frederick Arthur Earl of Derby

57 Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon

58 Sidney Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

59 Charles Pepys Earl of Devon

60 Henry Molyneux Paget Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire

61 Rudolph Robert Basil Aloysius Augustine Earl of Denbigh

62 Anthony Mildmay Julian Earl of Westmorland

63 Montague Peregrine Albemarle Earl of Lindsey

64 William Earl of Stamford

65 Henry Stormont Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham

66 Edwyn Francis Earl of Chesterfield

67 Edward George Henry Earl of Sandwich

68 George Devereux de Vere Earl of Essex

69 George James Earl of Carlisle

70 William Henry Walter Earl of Doncaster. (*Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry*)

71 Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury
72 Randal Mowbray Thomas Earl of Berkeley
73 Montagu Arthur Earl of Abingdon
74 Aldred Frederick George Beresford Earl of Scarborough
75 Arnold Allan Cecil Earl of Albemarle
76 George William Earl of Coventry
77 Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey
78 William John Lydston Earl Poulett
79 John Francis Erskine Earl of Mar. (*Elected for Scotland*)
80 Sholto George Watson Earl of Morton. (*Elected for Scotland*)
81 Walter John Francis Earl of Mar and Kellie. (*Elected for Scotland*)
82 George Earl of Haddington. (*Elected for Scotland*)
83 Frederick Henry Earl of Lauderdale. (*Elected for Scotland*)
84 Robert Harris Carnwath Earl of Carnwath. (*Elected for Scotland*)
85 Ronald Ruthven Earl of Leven and Melville. (*Elected for Scotland*)
86 David John Earl of Northesk. (*Elected for Scotland*)
87 Douglas Mackinnon Baillie Hamilton Earl of Dundonald. (*Elected for Scotland*)
88 Sewallis Edward Earl Ferrers
89 William Heneage Earl of Dartmouth
90 George Montagu Earl of Tankerville
91 Charles Wightwick Earl of Aylesford
92 James Richard Earl Stanhope
93 George Loveden William Henry Earl of Macclesfield
94 Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl Graham. (*Duke of Montrose*)
95 William Frederick Earl Waldegrave
96 Bertram Earl of Ashburnham
97 Charles Augustus Earl of Harrington
98 Newton Earl of Portsmouth
99 Francis Richard Charles Guy Earl Brooke and Earl of Warwick
100 Sidney Carr Earl of Buckinghamshire
101 William Charles De Meuron Earl Fitzwilliam
102 Frederick George Earl of Guilford
103 John Manners Earl of Hardwicke
04 Giles Stephen Holland Earl of Ilchester
105 Gilbert George Reginald Earl De La Warr
106 Jacob Earl of Radnor
107 John Poyntz Earl Spencer
108 Seymour Henry Earl Bathurst
109 Arthur Wills John Wellington Trumbull Blundell Earl of Hillsborough. (*Marquess of Downshire*)
110 Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon
111 William David Earl of Mansfield
112 John James Hugh Henry Earl Strange. (*Duke of Atholl*)
113 William Henry Earl of Mount Edgcumbe
114 Hugh Earl Fortescue
115 George Edward Stanhope Molyneux Earl of Carnarvon
116 George Henry Earl Cadogan
117 James Edward Earl of Malmesbury
118 Anthony Francis Earl of Westmeath. (*Elected for Ireland*)
119 Ponsonby William Earl of Drogheda (*Elected for Ireland*)
120 Ivo Francis Walter Earl of Darnley. (*Elected for Ireland*)
121 Dermot Robert Wyndham Earl of Mayo. (*Elected for Ireland*)
122 Hugh Earl Annesley. (*Elected for Ireland*)
123 Ralph Francis Earl of Wicklow. (*Elected for Ireland*)
124 George Earl of Lucan. (*Elected for Ireland*)
125 Somerset Richard Earl of Belmore (*Elected for Ireland*)
126 James Francis Earl of Bandon (*Elected for Ireland*)
127 James Francis Harry Earl of Rosslyn
128 William George Robert Earl of Craven
129 William Hillier Earl of Onslow

130 Charles Earl of Romney
131 Jocelyn Brudenell Earl of Chichester
132 Arthur George Earl of Wilton
133 George Charles Earl of Powis
134 Horatio Earl Nelson
135 Lawrence Earl of Rosse. (*Elected for Ireland*)
136 Charles William Sydney Earl Manvers
137 Robert Horace Earl of Orford
138 Albert Henry George Earl Grey
139 Hugh Cecil Earl of Lonsdale
140 John Herbert Dudley Earl of Harrowby
141 Henry Ulick Earl of Harewood
142 Gilbert John Earl of Minto
143 Alan Earl Cathcart
144 James Walter Earl of Verulam
145 Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl Brownlow
146 Henry Cornwallis Earl of St Germans
147 Albert Edmund Earl of Morley
148 George Cecil Orlando Earl of Bradford
149 William Earl Beauchamp
150 John Earl of Eldon
151 Richard George Penn Earl Howe
152 George Edward John Mowbray Earl of Stradbroke
153 Algernon William Stephen Earl Temple of Stowe
154 Francis Charles Earl of Kilmorey (*Elected for Ireland*)
155 Charles Stewart Earl Vane. (*Marquess of Londonderry*)
156 William Archer Earl Amherst
157 Frederick Archibald Vaughan Earl Cawdor
158 Aubrey Earl of Munster
159 Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of Camperdown
160 Thomas Francis Earl of Lichfield
161 John George Earl of Durham
162 Granville George Earl Granville
163 Henry Alexander Gordon Earl of Effingham
164 Henry John Earl of Ducie
165 Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yarborough
166 Henry John Earl Innes. (*Duke of Roxburghe*)
167 Thomas William Earl of Leicester
168 Ralph Gordon Earl of Lovelace
169 Charles William Francis Earl of Gainsborough
170 Francis Charles Granville Earl of Ellesmere
171 Francis Edmund Cecil Earl of Strafford
172 Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of Cottenham
173 Henry Arthur Mornington Earl Cowley
174 George Arnulph Earl of Winton (*Earl of Eglintoun*)
175 William Humble Earl of Dudley
176 John Francis Stanley Earl Russell
177 John Earl of Kimberley
178 Vesey Earl of Dartrey
179 William Ernest Earl of Feversham
180 Francis John Earl of Wharncliffe
181 Francis George Earl of Northbrook
182 Wilfrid Dallas Earl Cairns
183 Victor Alexander George Robert Earl of Lytton
184 Edward George Earl of Lathom
185 George Edward Earl Sondes
186 William Waldegrave Earl of Selborne
187 Walter Stafford Earl of Iddesleigh
188 William Francis Henry Earl of Londesborough
189 Gathorne Earl of Cranbrook
190 Gilbert Henry Earl of Ancaster
191 Charles Robert Earl Carrington
192 Robert Offley Ashburton Earl of Crewe. (*In another place as Lord President of the Council*)
193 Wilbraham Earl Egerton
194 Hardinge Stanley Earl of Halsbury
195 Frederick Sleigh Earl Roberts
196 Evelyn Earl of Cromer
197 Robert George Earl of Plymouth
198 Cecil George Savile Earl of Liverpool. (*In another place as Lord Steward of the Household*)
199 Charles Robert Viscount Althorp. *Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*
200 Robert Viscount Hereford

201 Byron Plantagenet Viscount Falkland. (*Elected for Scotland*)
202 ——— Viscount Bolingbroke and St. John
203 Charles George Viscount Cobham
204 Evelyn Edward Thomas Viscount Falmouth
205 George Master Viscount Torrington
206 Maurice Viscount Leinster. (*Duke of Leinster*)
207 Francis Wheler Viscount Hood
208 Henry William Crosbie Viscount Bangor. (*Elected for Ireland*)
209 Carnegie Parker Viscount St. Vincent
210 Charles Saunders Viscount Melville
211 William Wells Viscount Sidmouth
212 Henry Edward Montagu Dorington Clotworthy Viscount Templetown. (*Elected for Ireland*)
213 John Campbell Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*)
214 Edward Addington Hargreaves Viscount Exmouth
215 Richard Walter John Viscount Hutchinson. (*Earl of Donoughmore*)
216 William Frederick Viscount Clancarty. (*Earl of Clancarty*)
217 Francis Lynch Wellington Viscount Combermere
218 Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury
219 Rowland Richard Viscount Hill
220 Henry Charles Viscount Hardinge
221 Hugh Viscount Gough
222 Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax
223 Arthur Wellington Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport
224 William Henry Berkeley Viscount Portman
225 Henry Robert Viscount Hampden
226 Garnet Joseph Viscount Wolseley
227 Richard Assheton Viscount Cross
228 Arthur Wellesley Viscount Peel
229 Henry Thurstan Viscount Knutsford
230 Henry Viscount Llandaff
231 Reginald Baliol Viscount Esher
232 George Joachim Viscount Goschen
233 Matthew White Viscount Ridley
234 Horatio Herbert Viscount Kitchener of Khartoum and of the Vaal
235 Charles Robert William Viscount Colville of Culross.
236 Victor Albert Francis Charles Viscount Churchill
237 Alfred Viscount Milner
238 William Court Viscount Selby
239 Edward Cecil Viscount Iveagh
240 Charles Robert Viscount Althorp. (*In another place as Lord Chamberlain of the Household*)
241 Godfrey Charles Viscount Tredegar
242 Michael Edward Viscount St. Aldwyn.
243 Arthur Foley Bishop of London
244 Handley Carr Glyn Bishop of Durham
245 Herbert Edward Bishop of Winchester
246 Ernest Roland Bishop of Chichester
247 William Boyd Bishop of Ripon
248 Edward Bishop of Lincoln
249 John Bishop of Salisbury
250 Francis John Bishop of Chester
251 Alfred George Bishop of St. Asaph
252 John Bishop of Truro
253 Augustus Bishop of Lichfield
254 John Bishop of Norwich
255 George Wyndham Bishop of Bath and Wells
256 John Bishop of Hereford
257 Edward Stuart Bishop of Southwark
258 Edgar Bishop of St. Albans
259 Edward Carr Bishop of Peterborough
260 John Bishop of St. David's
261 George Forrest Bishop of Bristol.
262 George Rodney Bishop of Wakefield
263 Watkin Herbert Bishop of Bangor
264 Francis James Bishop of Liverpool
265 Francis Bishop of Oxford.
266 Charles Bishop of Birmingham
267 Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.
268 Charles Botolph Joseph Lord Mowbray
269 Albert Edward Delaval Lord Hastings

270 Jack Southwell Lord de Clifford

271 Charles John Robert Lord Clinton

272 Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth

273 Rawdon George Grey Lord Grey de Ruthyn

274 Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botreaux. (*Earl of Loudoun*)

275 Ralph Francis Julian Lord Camoys

276 Richard Greville Lord Willoughby de Broke

277 Hubert George Charles Lord Vaux of Harrowden

278 Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth. (*In another place as Earl of Lovelace*)

279 Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Braye

280 William Henry John Lord North

281 Beauchamp Moubray Lord St. John of Bletso

282 Thomas Evelyn Lord Howard de Walden

283 Bernard Henry Philip Lord Petre

284 John Fiennes Lord Saye and Sele

285 John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour

286 Ronald John Lord Dormer

287 Henry John Philip Sidney Lord Teynham

288 Fitzherbert Lord Stafford

289 George Frederick William Lord Byron

290 ———— Lord Lucas

291 Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh

292 Henry John Brinsley Lord Manners of Haddon. (*Marquess of Granby*)

293 Henry de Vere Lord Barnard

294 Alexander William Frederick Lord Saltoun. (*Elected for Scotland*)

295 Charles William Lord Sinclair. (*Elected for Scotland*)

296 Archibald Patrick Thomas Lord Borthwick (*Elected for Scotland*)

297 James Walter Lord Torphichen. (*Elected for Scotland*)

298 Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. (*Elected for Scotland*)

299 Alexander Charles Lord Belhaven and Stenton. (*Elected for Scotland*)

300 Charles Spencer Canning Lord Boyle. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery*)

301 Archibald Fitzroy George Lord Hay. (*Earl of Kinnoul*)

302 Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton

303 Augustus Debonnaire John Lord Monson

304 Walter William Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. (*Earl of Bessborough*)

305 Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale

306 George Florance Lord Boston

307 Augustus Arthur Lord Lovel and Holland. (*Earl of Egmont*)

308 George Francis Augustus Lord Vernon

309 Edward Henry Trafalgar Lord Digby

310 Martin Bladen Lord Hawke

311 Fitzalan Charles John Lord Foley

312 Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor

313 Thomas Lord Walsingham

314 William Lord Bagot

315 Charles Henry Lord Southampton

316 John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley

317 George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney

318 Arthur Herbert Tennyson Lord Somers

319 Richard Henry Lord Berwick

320 Edward Lennox Lord Sherborne

321 Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. (*Marquess of Waterford*)

322 Richard Henry Lord Carleton. (*Earl of Shannon*)

323 Charles Lord Suffield

324 Lloyd Lord Kenyon

325 Henry Lord Braybrooke

326 Edward Arthur Donald St. George Lord Fisherwick. (*Marquess of Donegall*)

327 Henry Charles Lord Gage. (*Viscount Gage*)

328 Thomas John Lord Thurlow

329 William Morton Lord Auckland

330 Thomas Charles Lord Mendip, (*Viscount Clifden*)

331 Francis James Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. (*Earl of Moray*)

332 Randolph Henry Lord Stewart of Garlies. (*Earl of Galloway*)

333 James George Henry Lord Saltersford. (*Earl of Courtown*)

334 William Lord Brodrick. (*Viscount Midleton*)

335 Augustus Cholmondeley Lord Calthorpe

336 Peter Robert Lord Gwydir

337 William Thomas Lord Bolton

338 John Lord Lilford

339 Thomas Lord Ribblesdale

340 Robert St. John FitzWalter Lord Dunboyne. (*Elected for Ireland*)

341 Lucius William Lord Inchiquin. (*Elected for Ireland*)

342 John Thomas William Lord Massy. (*Elected for Ireland*)

343 Hamilton Matthew Fitzmaurice Lord Muskerry. (*Elected for Ireland*)

344 Francis William Lord Kilmaine. (*Elected for Ireland*)

345 Luke Gerald Lord Clonbrock (*Elected for Ireland*)

346 Charles Mark Lord Headley. (*Elected for Ireland*)

347 Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. (*Elected for Ireland*)

348 Hercules Edward Lord Langford (*Elected for Ireland*)

349 Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry (*Elected for Ireland*)

350 Henry O'Callaghan Lord Dunalley (*Elected for Ireland*)

351 John Henry Lord Loftus. (*Marquess of Ely*)

352 William Lord Carysfort. (*Earl of Carysfort*)

353 George Ralph Lord Abercromby

354 Edward Downes Lord Ellenborough

355 Michael Edwin Marcus Lord Sandys

356 Henry North Lord Sheffield. (*Earl of Sheffield*)

357 William Macnaghten Lord Erskine

358 Henry Ulick Lord Monteagle (*Marquess of Sligo*)

359 Bernard Arthur William Patrick Hastings Lord Granard. (*Earl of Granard*)

360 ———————— Lord Gardner

361 John Thomas Lord Manners

362 Albert Edward Lord Castlemaine (*Elected for Ireland*)

363 Charles Lord Meldrum. (*Marquess of Huntly*)

364 Lowry Egerton Lord Grinstead. (*Earl of Enniskillen*)

365 William Henry Edmond de Vere Sheaffe Lord Foxford. (*Earl of Limerick*)

366 George Robert Canning Lord Harris

367 Reginald Charles Edward Lord Colchester

368 Robert Schomberg Lord Ker. (*Marquess of Lothian*)

369 Victor George Henry Francis Lord Minster. (*Marquess Conyngham*)

370 James Edward William Theobald Lord Ormonde. (*Marquess of Ormonde*)

371 Francis Richard Lord Wemyss. (*Earl of Wemyss*)

372 Thomas Lord Silchester. (*Earl of Longford*)

373 Algernon William John Clotworthy Lord Oriel. (*Viscount Massereene*)

374 Arthur Thomas Lord Ravensworth

375 Hugh Lord Delamere

376 Cecil Theodore Lord Forester

377 John William Lord Rayleigh

378 Edric Frederic Lord Gifford

379 Hubert George Lord Somerhill. (*Marquess of Clanricarde*)

380 James Ludovic Lord Wigan. (*Earl of Crawford*)

381 Uchter John Mark Lord Ranfurly (*Earl of Ranfurly*)

382 Charles Stuart Henry Lord Tenterden

383 William Lee Lord Plunket

384 Leonard Lord Heytesbury

385 Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. (*Earl of Rosebery*)

386 Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. (*Earl of Clanwilliam*)

387 Philip George Lord Wynford

388 Charles Gore Lord Kilmarnock. (*Earl of Erroll*)

389 Arthur James Francis Lord Fingall. (*Earl of Fingall*)

390 Osbert Cecil Lord Sefton. (*Earl of Sefton*)
391 Charles Lord Clements. (*Earl of Leitrim*)
392 Geoffrey Thomas Lord Kenlis. (*Marquess of Headfort*)
393 Reginald Lord Chaworth. (*Earl of Meath*)
394 Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. (*Earl of Dunmore*)
395 Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord Poltimore
396 Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord Mostyn
397 Henry Spencer Lord Templemore
398 Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry
399 James St. Vincent Lord de Saumarez
400 Thomas Lord Denman
401 Shelley Leopold Laurence Lord Abinger
402 Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley
403 Francis Denzil Edward Lord Ashburton
404 Edward George Percy Lord Hatherton
405 Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord Worlingham. (*Earl of Gosford*)
406 Hallyburton George Lord Stratheden
407 Geoffrey Henry Browne Lord Oranmore and Browne. (*Elected for Ireland*)
408 Simon Joseph Lord Lovat
409 William Spencer Lord Bateman
410 Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord Kintore. (*Earl of Kintore*)
411 Derrick Warner William Lord Rossmore
412 Robert Shapland George Julian Lord Carew
413 William Ashley Webb Lord De Mauley
414 Arthur Lord Wrottesley
415 Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley
416 Paul Sanford Lord Methuen
417 Edward Lyulph Lord Stanley of Alderley
418 Francis Dudley Lord Leigh
419 Beilby Lord Wenlock
420 William Lord Lurgan
421 Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon
422 John Reginald Upton Lord Seaton
423 John Hew North Gustave Henry Lord Oxenfoord. (*Earl of Stair*)
424 George Crespigny Brabazon Lord Vivian
425 Henry Lord Congleton
426 Charles Bertram Lord Bellew. (*Elected for Ireland*)
427 Victor Alexander Lord Elgin (*Earl of Elgin and Kincardine*)
428 Arthur Lord de Freyne
429 Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards
430 George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord Raglan
431 Valentine Charles Lord Kenmare. (*Earl of Kenmare*)
432 Henry Lord Belper
433 Richard Wogan Lord Talbot de Malahide
434 Robert Wellesley Lord Ebury
435 Charles Compton William Lord Chesham
436 Frederic John Napier Lord Chelmsford
437 John Lord Churston
438 Charles Henry Lord Leconfield
439 Courtenay Robert Percy Lord Lyveden
440 Henry Charles Lord Brougham and Vaux
441 Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaird
442 Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord Westbury
443 Charles Paget Fitzhardinge Lord Fitzhardinge
444 Luke Lord Annaly
445 William Gaspard Guy Lord Romilly
446 James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. (*Lord Athlumney*)
447 Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*)
448 Henry Power Charles Stanley Lord Monck. (*Viscount Monck*)
449 Charles Henry Chandos Lord Hartismere. (*Lord Henniker*)
450 Hylton George Hylton Lord Hylton

451 George Sholto Gordon Lord Penrhyn
452 Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth (*Viscount Boyne*)
453 John Henry Lord Kesteven
454 Arthur Lord Ormathwaite
455 Edward Lord O'Neill
456 Robert William Lord Napier
457 Jenico William Joseph Lord Gormanston. (*Viscount Gormanston*)
458 Thomas Kane Lord Rathdonnell. (*Elected for Ireland*)
459 John Hamilton Lord Lawrence
460 John Lord Dunning. (*Lord Rollo*)
461 Charles Noel Lord Balinhard. (*Earl of Southesk*)
462 William Lord Hare. (*Earl of Listowel*)
463 Francis Edward Lord Howard of Glossop
464 Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord Castletown
465 Richard Maximilian Lord Acton
466 Frederick Lord Wolverton
467 Algernon William Fulke Lord Greville
468 Maurice Herbert Ignatius Towneley Lord O'Hagan
469 William Lord Sandhurst
470 William John George Lord Ettrick. (*Lord Napier*)
471 Sidney James Lord Somerton. (*Earl of Normanton*)
472 Henry Campbell Lord Aberdare
473 Henry James Lord Moncrieff
474 Bernard John Seymour Lord Coleridge
475 Thomas William Gaston Lord Emly
476 Thomas Francis Lord Cottesloe
477 Herbert Perrott Murray Lord Hampton
478 Charles Alexander Lord Douglas (*Earl of Home*)
479 Arthur George Maule Lord Ramsay (*Earl of Dalhousie*)
480 John Henry Lord Fermanagh. (*Earl Erne*)
481 George Ralph Charles Lord Harlech
482 Humphrey Napier Lord Alington
483 Bentley Lyonel John Lord Tollemache
484 Frederic John Lord Gerard
485 Lionel Sackville Lord Sackville
486 Charles Leigh Lord Norton
487 Walter Bulkeley Lord Shute. (*Viscount Barrington*)
488 Lawrence William Lord Haldon
489 Ivor Bertie Lord Wimborne
490 Arthur Edward Lord Ardilaun
491 Charles Wallace Alexander Napier Lord Lamington
492 Arthur William Lord Trevor
493 Edward Lord Brabourne
494 Arthur Oliver Villiers Lord Ampthill
495 William Montagu Lord Tweeddale. (*Marquess of Tweeddale*)
496 William Ulick Tristram Lord Howth. (*Earl of Howth*)
497 Donald James Lord Reay
498 Harcourt Lord Derwent
499 Henry James Lord Hothfield
500 Edward Lord Tweedmouth
501 Hallam Lord Tennyson
502 James Lord Strathspey. (*Earl of Seafield*)
503 John William Lord Monk Bretton
504 Walter Henry Lord Northbourne
505 Arthur Jocelyn Charles Lord Sudley. (*Earl of Arran*)
506 Marmaduke Francis Lord Herries
507 Mervyn Richard Lord Powerscourt
508 Frederick Lord Northington. (*Lord Henley*)
509 Nathaniel Mayer Lord Rothschild
510 John Lord Revelstoke
511 Robert Lord Monkswell
512 Edward Lord Ashbourne
513 Rowland Lord Saint Oswald
514 Robert Wilfrid Lord Deramore
515 John Walter Edward Lord Montagu of Beaulieu
516 Sidney Herbert Lord Elphinstone
517 Richard Farrer Lord Herschell
518 Charles William Lord Hillingdon
519 Charles Lord Hindlip
520 Ernest William Lord Grimthorpe
521 Richard de Aquila Lord Stalbridge
522 Hugh Lord Kensington

523 Michael Arthur Lord Burton

524 Gavin George Lord Hamilton of Dalzell

525 Thomas Lord Brassey

526 Henry Lord Thring

527 Edward Lord Macnaghten. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

528 Claude George Lord Bowes. (*Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn*)

529 George Edmund Milnes Lord Monckton. (*Viscount Galway*)

530 John Lord Saint Levan

531 Dudley Stuart Lord Magheramorne

532 George Limbrey Lord Basing

533 William Henry Lord de Ramsey

534 Herbert Francis Lord Cheylesmore

535 Egerton Lord Addington

536 John Savile Lord Savile

537 William Ventris Lord Field

538 George Lord Mount Stephen

539 Samuel Lord Masham

540 William Lord Kelvin

541 George Lord Ashcombe

542 Archibald Campbell Lord Blythswood

543 Thomas Lord Crawshaw

544 William Amhurst Lord Amherst of Hackney

545 Thomas Wodehouse Lord Newton

546 Henry Lyle Lord Dunleath

547 John Allan Lord Llangattock

548 George James Lord Playfair

549 Cyril Lord Battersea

550 Ernest Ambrose Lord Swansea

551 Thomas Cecil Lord Farrer

552 John Campbell Lord Overtoun

553 Arthur Lord Stanmore

554 Stuart Lord Rendel

555 Reginald Earle Lord Welby

556 Horace Lord Davey. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

557 Edward Douglas Lord Loch

558 Sydney James Lord Wandsworth

559 James Lord Ashton

560 Herbert Coulstoun Lord Burghclere

561 Henry Lord James

562 David Robert Lord Rathmore

563 Algernon Lord Glenesk

564 Henry Hucks Lord Aldenham

565 Edward Lord Heneage

566 Hercules Arthur Temple Lord Rosmead

567 Alexander Smith Lord Kinnear

568 Joseph Lord Lister

569 David Lord Fairlie. (*Earl of Glasgow*)

570 Hugh Richard Lord Dawnay. (*Viscount Downe*)

571 Henry Ludlow Lord Ludlow

572 Hans Wellesley Lord Holm Patrick

573 James Cleland Lord Inverclyde

574 Donald Alexander Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal

575 James Henry Cecil Lord Newlands

576 Horace Brand Lord Farquhar

577 Josslyn Francis Lord Muncaster

578 Arthur Lawrence Lord Haliburton

579 Philip Henry Wodehouse Lord Currie

580 Joseph Henry Russell Lord Glanusk

581 Henry Lord Brampton

582 Bertram Francis Lord Cranworth

583 James Patrick Bannerman Lord Robertson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

584 Henry Stafford Lord Northcote

585 John Lord Avebury

586 Nathaniel Lord Lindley.

587 Martin Henry Lord Killanin.

588 Peter Lord O'Brien

589 Richard Everard Lord Alverstone

590 Patrick Lord Kinross

591 Ughtred James Lord Shuttleworth
592 William Lawies Lord Allerton
593 Arthur Hugh Lord Barrymore
594 Francis Wallace Lord Grenfell
595 Francis Lord Knollys
596 Algernon Bertram Lord Redesdale
597 Edward Levy Lord Burnham.
598 Michael Lord Biddulph.
599 George Thomas John Lord Estcourt
600 William Henry Armstrong Fitz-Patrick Lord Armstrong.
601 Andrew Graham Lord Dunedin
602 Alexander John Lord Leith of Fyvie
603 John Lord Atkinson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)
604 Charles Lord Ritchie of Dundee
605 Thomas Henry Lord Sanderson
606 William Hood Lord Waleran
607 Henry Meysey Lord Knaresborough
608 Alfred Charles William Lord Northcliffe
609 Herbert Lord Michelham
610 Edmund Becket Lord Faber
611 William Henry Lord Desborough
612 Robert Threshie Lord Loreburn. (*In another place as Lord High Chancellor*)
613 Edmond George Petty Lord Fitzmaurice
614 Philip James Lord Weardale
615 Arthur Divett Lord Haversham
616 Charles Hare Lord Hemphill
617 James Lord Joicey
618 Charles Henry Lord Numberholme
619* William Henry Lord Winterstoke

---

* This number is in excess of the total Number of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the Discrepancy being caused by the following Lords being twice named in the Roll:

Lord Loreburn as Lord High Chancellor and as Lord Loreburn (Nos. 5 and 612).

Earl of Crewe as Lord President and as Earl of Crewe (Nos. 7 and 192).

Marquess of Ripon as Lord Privy Seal and as Marquess of Ripon (Nos. 8 and 48).

Earl of Liverpool as Lord Steward and as Earl of Liverpool (Nos. 54 and 198)

Viscount Althorp as Lord Chamberlain and as Viscount Althorp (Nos. 199 and 240)

Earl of Lovelace as Earl of Lovelace and as Lord Wentworth (Nos. 168 and 278)

523 Michael Arthur Lord Burton

524 Gavin George Lord Hamilton of Dalzell

525 Thomas Lord Brassey

526 Henry Lord Thring

527 Edward Lord Macnaghten. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

528 Claude George Lord Bowes. (*Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn*)

529 George Edmund Milnes Lord Monckton. (*Viscount Galway*)

530 John Lord Saint Levan

531 Dudley Stuart Lord Magheramorne

532 George Limbrey Lord Basing

533 William Henry Lord de Ramsey

534 Herbert Francis Lord Cheylesmore

535 Egerton Lord Addington

536 John Savile Lord Savile

537 William Ventris Lord Field

538 George Lord Mount Stephen

539 Samuel Lord Masham

540 William Lord Kelvin

541 George Lord Ashcombe

542 Archibald Campbell Lord Blythswood

543 Thomas Lord Crawshaw

544 William Amhurst Lord Amherst of Hackney

545 Thomas Wodehouse Lord Newton

546 Henry Lyle Lord Dunleath

547 John Allan Lord Llangattock

548 George James Lord Playfair

549 Cyril Lord Battersea

550 Ernest Ambrose Lord Swansea

551 Thomas Cecil Lord Farrer

552 John Campbell Lord Overtoun

553 Arthur Lord Stanmore

554 Stuart Lord Rendel

555 Reginald Earle Lord Welby

556 Horace Lord Davey. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

557 Edward Douglas Lord Loch

558 Sydney James Lord Wandsworth

559 James Lord Ashton

560 Herbert Coulstoun Lord Burghclere

561 Henry Lord James

562 David Robert Lord Rathmore

563 Algernon Lord Glenesk

564 Henry Hucks Lord Aldenham

565 Edward Lord Heneage

566 Hercules Arthur Temple Lord Rosmead

567 Alexander Smith Lord Kinnear

568 Joseph Lord Lister

569 David Lord Fairlie. (*Earl of Glasgow*)

570 Hugh Richard Lord Dawnay. (*Viscount Downe*)

571 Henry Ludlow Lord Ludlow

572 Hans Wellesley Lord Holm Patrick

573 James Cleland Lord Inverclyde

574 Donald Alexander Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal

575 James Henry Cecil Lord Newlands

576 Horace Brand Lord Farquhar

577 Josslyn Francis Lord Muncaster

578 Arthur Lawrence Lord Haliburton

579 Philip Henry Wodehouse Lord Currie

580 Joseph Henry Russell Lord Glanusk

581 Henry Lord Brampton

582 Bertram Francis Lord Cranworth

583 James Patrick Bannerman Lord Robertson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)

584 Henry Stafford Lord Northcote

585 John Lord Avebury

586 Nathaniel Lord Lindley.

587 Martin Henry Lord Killanin.

588 Peter Lord O'Brien

589 Richard Everard Lord Alverstone

590 Patrick Lord Kinross

591 Ughtred James Lord Shuttleworth
592 William Lawies Lord Allerton
593 Arthur Hugh Lord Barrymore
594 Francis Wallace Lord Grenfell
595 Francis Lord Knollys
596 Algernon Bertram Lord Redesdale
597 Edward Levy Lord Burnham.
598 Michael Lord Biddulph.
599 George Thomas John Lord Estcourt
600 William Henry Armstrong Fitz-Patrick Lord Armstrong.
601 Andrew Graham Lord Dunedin
602 Alexander John Lord Leith of Fyvie
603 John Lord Atkinson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary*)
604 Charles Lord Ritchie of Dundee
605 Thomas Henry Lord Sanderson
606 William Hood Lord Waleran
607 Henry Meysey Lord Knaresborough
608 Alfred Charles William Lord Northcliffe
609 Herbert Lord Michelham
610 Edmund Becket Lord Faber
611 William Henry Lord Desborough
612 Robert Threshie Lord Loreburn. (*In another place as Lord High Chancellor*)
613 Edmond George Petty Lord Fitzmaurice
614 Philip James Lord Weardale
615 Arthur Divett Lord Haversham
616 Charles Hare Lord Hemphill
617 James Lord Joicey
618 Charles Henry Lord Numberholme
619* William Henry Lord Winterstoke

---

* This number is in excess of the total Number of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the Discrepancy being caused by the following Lords being twice named in the Roll :

Lord Loreburn as Lord High Chancellor and as Lord Loreburn (Nos. 5 and 612).

Earl of Crewe as Lord President and as Earl of Crewe (Nos. 7 and 192).

Marquess of Ripon as Lord Privy Seal and as Marquess of Ripon (Nos. 8 and 48).

Earl of Liverpool as Lord Steward and as Earl of Liverpool (Nos. 54 and 198)

Viscount Althorp as Lord Chamberlain and as Viscount Althorp (Nos. 199 and 240)

Earl of Lovelace as Earl of Lovelace and as Lord Wentworth (Nos. 168 and 278)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
AND THE THIRD OF KING EDWARD VII.

(*Compiled at the Opening of the Session.*)

A

Abraham, William (Glamorgan, Rhondda)

Abraham, William (Cork Co., N.E.)

Acland, F. D. (Yorkshire, Richmond)

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A., Bt. (Somerset, Wellington)

Adkins, W. R. (Lancashire S.E., Middleton)

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R. (Cornwall, Bodmin)

Agnew, George William (Salford, W.)

Ainsworth, John S. (Argyll)

Alden, P. (Middlesex, Tottenham)

Allen, A. A. (Christchurch)

Allen, Charles P. (Gloucester, Stroud)

Ambrose, Dr. Robert (Mayo, W.)

Annand, J. (Aberdeenshire, E.)

Anson, Sir William R., Bt. (Oxford University)

Anstruther-Gray, Major (St. Andrews Burghs)

Arkwright, John S. (Hereford)

Armitage, R. (Leeds, Central)

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. (Croydon)

Ashley, W.W. (Lancashire, N. (Blackpool)

Ashton, Thomas Gair (Beds., Luton)

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H. (Fife,) E.

Astbury, J. M. K.C. (Lancashire, Southport)

Atherley-Jones, Llewellyn (Durham, N.W.)

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H., Bt., (Sussex, Lewes)

B

Baker, J. Allen (Finsbury, E.)

Baker, Sir J. (Portsmouth)

Balcarres, Lord (Lancashire, N., Chorley)

Baldwin, Alfred (Worcester, Bewdley)

Balfour, Captain Charles B. (Middlesex, Hornsey)

Balfour, R. (Lanark, Partick)

Baring, G. (Isle of Wight)

Baring, Hon. G. V. (Winchester)

Barker, J. (Penryn and Falmouth)

Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset, Frome)

Barlow, P. (Bedford)

Barnard, E. B. (Kidderminster)

Barnes, J. N. (Glasgow, Blackfriars)

Barran, Rowland H. (Leeds, N.)

Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)

Barry, Edward (Cork Co., S.)

Beach, Hon. M. Hicks (Gloucester, Tewkesbury)

Beale, W. P. (Ayrshire, S.)

Beauchamp, H. W. (Suffolk, Lowestoft)

Beaumont, H. (Sussex, Eastbourne)

Beaumont, Wentworth C.B. (Northumberland, Hexham)

Beck, A. C. (Cambridge, Wisbech)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase (York, N.R., Whitby)
Bell, Richard (Derby)
Bellairs, C. (Lynn Regis)
Belloc, Hilaire V. P. R. (Salford, S.)
Benn, John W. (Devonport)
Benn, W. W. (Tower Hamlets, St. George)
Bennett, E. N. (Oxfordshire, Woodstock)
Berridge, T. H. D. (Warwick and Leamington)
Bertram, J. (Herts, Hitchin)
Bethell, E. H. (Essex, Maldon)
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bignold, Sir Arthur (Wick Burghs)
Billson, A. (Staffordshire, N.W.)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. A. (Bristol, N.)
Black, Alexander W. (Banffshire)
Black, A. W. (Beds, Biggleswade)
Blake, Hon. Edward (Longford, S.)
Boland, John P. (Kerry, South)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bottomley, H. W. (Hackney, S.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Hunts, Ramsey)
Bowerman, C. W. (Deptford)
Bowles, G. Stewart (Lambeth, Norwood)
Boyle, Sir E. Bt. (Taunton)
Brace, W. (Glamorgan, S.)
Bransden, T. A. (Portsmouth)
Branch, J. (Middlesex, Enfield)
Bridgeman, W. C. (Shropshire, Oswestry)
Brigg, John (Yorks, W.R., Keighley)
Bright, J. A. (Oldham)
Broadhurst, Henry (Leicester)
Brocklehurst, C. B. (Cheshire, Macclesfield)
Brodie, H. C. (Surrey, Reigate)
Brooke, G. S. (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley)
Brotherton, E. A. (Wakefield)
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancashire, S.W. Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T., Bt. (Cheshire, Northwich)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James (Aberdeen, S.)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas R. (Perthshire, E.)
Buckmaster, S. O. (Cambridge)
Bull, Sir William James (Hammersmith)
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. A. B. (Westminster)
Burke, E. Haviland (King's County Tullamore)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John (Battersea)
Burnyeat, W. J. D. (Whitehaven)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas (Morpeth)
Butcher, S. H. (Cambridge University)
Buxton, Rt. Hon. Sydney C. (Tower Hamlets, Poplar)
Byles, William Pollard (Salford, N.)

C

Cairns, T. (Newcastle-on-Tyne)
Caldwell, James (Lanark, Mid.)
Cameron, Robert (Durham, Houghton-le-Spring)
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H M. (Dublin University)
Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H., G.C.B. (Stirling Burghs)
Carlile, E. H. (Herts, St. Albans)
Carr-Comm, H. W. (Southwark, Rotherhithe)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. (Dublin University)
Castlereagh, Lord (Maidstone)
Causton, Rt. Hon. Richard Knight (Southwark, W.)
Cave, G. (Surrey, Kingston)
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. (Derbyshire, W.)
Cawley, Frederick (Lancs., Prestwich)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon. J. (Birmingham, W.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. Austen (Worcestershire, E.)
Chance, F. W. (Carlisle)
Channing, Francis A. (Northants, E.)
Cheetham, J. F. (Stalybridge)
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R. (Liverpool, Exchange)
Chiozza-Money, L. G. (Paddington, N.)
Churchill, Winston L. S. (Manchester, N.W.)
Clancy, John J. (Dublin Co., N.)
Clark, C. G. (Camberwell, Peckham)
Clarke, Sir Edward G. (City of London)

Cleland, J. W. (Glasgow, Bridgeton)
Clough, W. (Yorks, W.R., Skipton)
Clynes, J. R. (Manchester, N.E.)
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley (Ipswich)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. (Ayrshire, N.)
Cogan, Denis J. (Wicklow, E.)
Collinsg, Rt. Hon. Jesse (Birmingham, Bordesley)
Collings, S. (Lambeth, Kennington)
Collins, Sir W. J. (St. Pancras, W.)
Condon, Thomas J. (Tipperary, E.)
Cooper, Dr. G. (Southwark, Bermondsey)
Corbett, Arch. Cameron (Glasgow, Tradeston)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, East Grinstead)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, N.)
Cornwall, Sir E. A. (Bethnal, Green, N.E.)
Cory, C. J. (Cornwall, St. Ives)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S. (Nottingham, E.)
Courthope, G. L. (Sussex, Rye)
Cowan, W. H. (Surrey, Guildford)
Cox, Harold (Preston)
Craig, Charles C. (Antrim S.)
Craig, H. J. (Tynemouth)
Craig, Capt. J. (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir H. (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities)
Creane, Eugene (Cork, S.E.)
Cremer, William R. (Shoreditch, Haggerston)
Crombie, John William (Kincardineshire)
Crooks, W. (Woolwich)
Crosfield, A. H. (Warrington)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow, Camlachie)
Crossley, W. J. (Cheshire, Altrincham)
Cullinan, J. (Tipperary, S.)

D

Dalmeny, Lord (Edinburgh, Midlothan)
Dalrymple, Lord (Wigton)
Dalziel, James H. (Kirkcaldy Burghs)
Davies, D. (Montgomeryshire)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Davies, T. (Fulham)
Davies, T. Hart (Hackney, N.)
Davies, W. H. (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William (Queen's Co., Ossory)
Devlin, Charles R. (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Belfast, W., and Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, A. (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness)
Dickinson, W. H (St. Pancras, N.)
Dickson-Ponyder, Sir J. Bt. (Wilts, Chippenham)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W., Bt. (Gloucester, Forest of Dean)
Dillon, John (Mayo, E.)
Dixon, Rt. Hon. Sir D., Bt. (Belfast, N.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. D., Bt. (Middlesex, Uxbridge)
Dobson, T. W. (Plymouth)
Dodd, Serjeant W. H. (Tyrone, N.)
Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. (Cork, E.)
Doogan, P. C. (Tyrone, E.)
Doughty, Sir George (Great Grimsby)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. Aretas Akers (Kent, St. Augustine's)
Duckworth, J. (Stockport)
Du Cros, Harvey (Hastings)
Duffy, William J. (Galway, S.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. Hastings (Yorks, W.R., Otley)
Duncan, R. (Lanark, Govan)
Dunn, A. E. (Cornwall, Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. M. (Walsall)

E

Edwards, A. C. (Denbigh District)
Edwards, E. (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of (Peebles and Selk
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward (Nottingham, Rushcliffe)
Emmott, Alfred (Oldham)
Erskine, D. C. (Perthshire, W.)
Esmonde, Sir T. Grattan, Bt. (Wexford, N.)
Essex, R. W. (Gloucestershire, Cirencester)
Evans, Samuel Thomas, K.C. (Glamorgan, Mid.)
Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. (Tower Hamlets, Stepney)
Eve, H. Trelawney (Devon, Ashburton)
Everett, R. L. (Suffolk, Woodbridge)

F

Faber, G. Denison (York)
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, Andover)
Fardell, Sir T. George (Paddington, S.)
Farrell, James P. (Longford, N.)
Fell, A. (Great Yarmouth)
Fenwick, Charles (Northumberland, Wansbeck)
Ferens, T. R. (Hull E.)
Ferguson, Ronald C. Munro (Leith Burghs)
Fetherstonhaugh, G. (Fermanagh, N.)
Ffrench, Peter (Wexford, S.)
Field, William (Dublin, St. Patrick)
Fiennes, Hon. E. E. (Oxfordshire, Banbury)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H. (Rutland)
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph (Kerry, N.)
Fletcher, J. S. (Hampstead)
Flynn, James C. (Cork, N.)
Forster, Henry Wm. (Kent, Sevenoaks)
Foster, Sir B. Walter (Derby, Ilkeston).
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. (Wolverhampton, E.)
Fuller, John Michael F. (Wilts, Westbury)
Fullerton, H. (Cumberland, Egremont)
Furness, Sir Christopher (Hartlepool)

G

Gardner, Col. A. (Herefordshire, Ross)
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, Wokingham)
Gibb, J. (Middlesex, Harrow)
Gibbs, Hon. Alban George H. (City of London)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, W.)
Gilhooly, James (Cork Co., W.)
Gill, A. H. (Bolton)
Ginnell, L. (Westmeath, N.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J. (Leeds, W.)
Glen-Coats, Sir T., Bt. (Renfrewshire W.)
Glendinning, R. (Antrim, N.)
Glover, T. (St. Helens)
Goddard, Daniel Ford (Ipswich)
Gooch, G. P. (Bath)
Gordon, John K.C. (Londonderry, S.)
Grant, Corrie, (Warwickshire, Rugby)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, H. (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward, Bt. (Northumberland, Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J. (Anglesey)
Grove, T. N. A. (Northants, S.)
Guest, Hon. Ivor C. (Cardiff District)
Gulland, J. W. (Dumfries Burghs)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton (Norfolk, N.)

H

Haddock, G. B. (Lancashire, North Lonsdale)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B. (Haddington)
Hall, F. (Yorks, W.R., Normanton)
Halpin, J. (Clare, W.)
Hambro, C. Eric (Surrey, Wimbledon)
Hamilton, Marquess of (Londonderry)
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis (Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale)
Hardie, James Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, G. A. (Suffolk, Stowmarket)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)
Harmood-Banner, J. S. (Liverpool, Everton)
Harmsworth, C. B. (Worcester, Droitwich)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester (Caithness)
Harrington, Timothy (Dublin, Harbour)
Harris, Dr. F. Rutherfoord (Camberwell, Dulwich)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B. (Yorks, E.R., Howdenshire)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George (Bolton)
Haslam, J. (Derbyshire, Chesterfield)
Haslam, L. (Monmouth Boroughs)
Haworth, Arthur A. (Manchester, S.)
Hay, Hon. Claude G. D. (Shoreditch, Hoxton)
Hayden, John P. (Roscommon, S.)
Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. (West Bromwich)
Healy, Timothy M. (Louth, N.)
Heaton-Armstrong, W. C. (Suffolk, Sudbury)

Heaton, J. Henniker (Canterbury)
Hedges, A. P. (Kent, Tonbridge)
Helme, Norval W. (Lancashire, N., Lancaster)
Helmsley, Lord (Yorks, N.R., Thirsk)
Henderson, Arthur (Durham, Barnard Castle)
Henderson, J. McD. (Aberdeenshire, W.)
Henry, C. S. (Shropshire, Wellington)
Herbert, Col. I. (Monmouthshire, S.)
Herbert, T. A. (Bucks, Wycombe)
Hervey, Capt. F. W. F. (Bury St. Edmunds)
Higham, John Sharp (Yorks, W.R., Sowerby)
Hill, Sir C. L. (Shrewsbury)
Hill, H. Staveley (Staffordshire, Kingswinford)
Hills, J. W. (Durham)
Hobart, Sir Robert (Hants, New Forest)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hodge, J. (Lancashire, S.E., Gorton)
Hogan, M. (Tipperary, N.)
Holden, E. H. (Lancashire, Heywood)
Holland, Sir William H. (Yorks, W.R., Rotherham)
Hooper, A. G. (Dudley)
Hope, J. D. (Fife, W.)
Hope, W. H. B. (Somerset, N.)
Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry, Bt. (Blackburn)
Horniman, E. J. (Chelsea)
Horridge, Thomas G. (Manchester, E.)
Houston, Robert P. (Liverpool, W. Toxteth)
Howard, Hon. G. (Cumberland, Eskdale)
Hudson, W. (Newcastle-on-Tyne)
Hunt, Rowland (Shropshire, Ludlow)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Yorks, W.R., Morley)
Hyde, C. G. (Wednesbury)

I

Idris, T. H. (Flint Boroughs)
Illingworth, P. (Yorks, W.R., Shipley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel (Reading)

J

Jackson, R. S. (Greenwich)
Jacoby, James Alfred (Derbyshire, Mid)
Jardine, Sir J. (Roxburghshire)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur F. (Hants, N.)
Jenkins, J. (Chatham)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Warwickshire, Nuneaton)
Joicey-Cecil, Lord J. (Lincolnshire, Stamford)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea District)
Jones, Leif (Westmoreland, Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvon, Arfon)
Jordan, Jeremiah (Fermanagh, S.)
Jowett, F. W. (Bradford, W.)
Joyce, M. (Limerick)

K

Kearley, Hudson E. (Devonport)
Kekewich, Sir G. W. (Exeter)
Kelley, G. D. (Manchester, S.W.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H., Bt., C.B. (Devon, Honiton)
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. Wm. (Shropshire, Newport)
Keswick, William (Surrey, Epsom)
Kilbride, Dennis (Kildare, S.)
Kimber, Sir Henry, Bt. (Wandsworth)
King, A. J. (Cheshire, Knutsford)
King, Sir H. Seymour (Hull, Central)
Kitson, Sir James, Bt. (Yorks, W.R., Colne Valley)

L

Laidlaw, R. (Renfrew, E.)
Lamb, E. (Hereford, Leominster)
Lamb, E. H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George (Devon, South Molton)
Lambton, Hon. F. W. (Durham, S.E.)
Lamont, Norman (Buteshire)
Lane-Fox, G. (Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash)
Langley, J. Batty (Sheffield, Attercliffe)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfred, Bt. (Cumberland, Cockermouth)
Layland-Barratt, F. (Devon, Torquay)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Lancashire, N.E., Accrington)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage (St. George's, Hanover Square)
Lehmann, R. C. (Leicester, Market Harborough)
Lever, A. L. (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirrall)
Levy, Maurice (Leicestershire, Loughborough)
Lewis, John Herbert (Flintshire)
Liddell, H. (Down, W.)
Lloyd George, Rt. Hon. David (Carnarvon, &c.)
Lockwood, Rt. Hon. Lt.-Col. Amelius (Essex, Epping)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Worcestershire, Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter H. (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John B. (Armagh, Mid)
Lough, Thomas (Islington, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis W. (Birmingham, Edgbaston)
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James William (Cumberland, Penrith)
Lundon, W. (Limerick, E.)
Lupton, A. (Lincolnshire, Sleaford)
Luttrell, H. F. (Devon, Tavistock)
Lyell, C. H. (Dorset, E.)
Lynch, H. F. B. (Yorks, W.R., Ripon)

M

Macdonald, J. A. M. (Falkirk Burghs)
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacIver, David (Liverpool, Kirkdale)
Mackarness, F. C. (Berks, Newbury)
Maclean, D. (Bath)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J. (Camberwell, North)
MacNeill, J. G. Swift (Donegal, S.)
Macpherson, J. T. (Preston)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
McArthur, William A. (Cornwall, St Austell)
McCallum, J. (Paisley)
McCalmont, Colonel James (Antrim, E.)
McCrae, George (Edinburgh, E.)
McHugh, Patrick A. (Sligo, N., and Leitrim, N.)
McIver, Sir Lewis, Bt. (Edinburgh, W.)
M'Kean, J. (Monaghan, S.)
McKenna, Reginald (Monmouth, N.)
M'Killop, W. (Armagh, S.)
McLaren, Sir C. B. Bright, Bt., (Leicester, Bosworth)
McLaren, H. D. (Staffordshire, W.)
McMicking, Major G. (Kirkcudbrightshire)
McVeigh, C. (Donegal, E.)
Maddison, F. (Burnley)
Magnus, Sir P. (London University)
Mallet, C. E. (Plymouth)
Mansfield, H. (Northants, Mid.)
Mansfield, H. R. (Lincoln, Spalding)
Markham, A. B. (Notts., Mansfield)
Marks, G. C. (Cornwall, Launceston)
Marks, H. H. (Kent, Thanet)
Marnham, F. J. (Surrey, Chertsey)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, J. F. (Windsor)
Massie, Dr. J. (Wilts, Cricklade)
Masterman, C. F. G. (West Ham, N.)
Meehan, P. A. (Queen's County, Leix)
Menzies, W. (Lanark, S.)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C. (Stafford, Handsworth)
Micklem, N., K.C., (Herts, Watford)
Middlemore, John T. (Birmingham, N.)
Mildmay, Francis B. (Devon, Totnes)
Mitchell-Thomson, W. (Lanark, N.W.)
Molteno P. A. (Dumfriesshire)
Mond, A. (Chester)
Montagu, E. S. (Cambs., Chesterton)
Montgomery, H. G. (Somerset, Bridgewater)
Mooney, John J. (Newry)
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall, Truro)
Morgan, John Lloyd (Carmarthen, W.)
Morley, Rt. Hon John (Montrose, &c.)
Morpeth, Lord (Birmingham, S.)
Morrell, P. (Oxon, Henley)
Morse, L. L. (Wilts, Wilton)
Morton, A. C. (Sutherland)
Moss, Samuel (Denbighshire, E.)
Muntz, Sir Philip Albert, Bt. (Warwickshire, Tamworth)

Murnaghan, George (Tyrone, Mid.)
Murphy, John (Kerry, E.)
Myer, Horatio (Lambeth, N.)

N

Nannetti, Joseph P. (Dublin, College Green)
Napier, T. B. (Kent, Faversham)
Newnes, F. (Notts. Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George, Bt. (Swansea Town)
Nicholls, G. (Northants, N.)
Nicholson, C. N. (Yorks, W.R., Doncaster)
Nicholson, William G. (Hants., Petersfield)
Nield, H. (Middlesex, Ealing)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, S.)
Norman, Henry (Wolverhampton, S.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil W. (Newington, W.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans (Pontefract)
Nuttall, H. (Lancashire, S.E., Stretford)

O

O'Brien, K. E. (Tipperary, Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, Thomas P. (Liverpool, Scotland)
O'Doherty, P. (Donegal, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Newington, Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, Thomas (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John (Sligo, S.)
O'Grady, J. (Leeds, E.)
O'Hara, P. (Monaghan, N.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William (Galway, Connemara)
O'Mara, James (Kilkenny, S.)
O'Neill, Hon. R. Torrens (Antrim, Mid)
O'Shaugnessy, P. J. (Limerick, W.)
O'Shee, James John (Waterford, W.)

P

Palmer, Sir Charles M., Bt. (Durham, Jarrow)
Parker, H. Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, J. (Halifax)
Parkes, Ebenezer (Birmingham, Central)
Partington, Oswald (Derbyshire, High Peak)
Paul, H. W. (Northampton)
Paulton, James M. (Durham, Bishop Auckland)
Pearce, R. (Staffordshire, Leek)
Pearce, W. (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir Weetman D., Bt. (Colchester)
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Pease, Joseph A. (Essex, Saffron Walden)
Percy, Lord (Kensington, S.)
Perks, Robert W. (Lincolnshire, Louth)
Philipps, Lt.-Col. Ivor (Southampton)
Philipps, John W. (Pembroke)
Philipps, O. C. (Pembroke and Haverfordwest)
Pickersgill, E. H. (Bethnal Green, S.W.)
Pirie, Duncan Vernon (Aberdeen, North)
Pollard, Dr. G. H. (Lancashire, S.E. Eccles)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp, Bt. (Wigan)
Power, Patrick J. (Waterford, E.)
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, East)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)

R

Radford, G. H. (Islington, E.)
Rainy, A. R. (Kilmarnock Burghs)
Raphael, H. H. (Derbyshire, S.)
Rasch, Major Sir Fred. C., Bt. (Essex, Chelmsford)
Ratcliff, R. F. (Staffordshire, Burton)
Rawlinson, J. F. P. (Cambridge University)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, W. R. (Scarborough)
Reckitt, Harold James (Lincolnshire, Brigg)
Reddy, M. (King's County, Birr)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William H. K. (Clare, E.)
Rees, J. D. (Montgomery Boroughs)
Remnant, James F. (Finsbury, Holborn)
Rendall, A. (Gloucester, Thornbury)

Renton, Major L. (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough)

Richards, Tom (Monmouthshire, W.)

Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton, W.)

Richardson, A. (Nottingham, S.)

Rickett, J. Compton (Yorks W.R., Osgoldcross)

Ridsdale, E. A. (Brighton)

Roberts, C. H. (Lincoln)

Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)

Roberts, John Bryn (Carnarvonshire, Eifion)

Roberts, John Herbert (Denbighshire, W.)

Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield, Ecclesall)

Robertson, Rt. Hn. Edmund (Dundee)

Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford, Central)

Robertson, J. M. (Northumberland, Tyneside)

Robinson, S. (Brecknock)

Robson, Sir Wm. Snowdon (South Shields)

Roche, Augustine (Cork)

Roche, John (Galway, E.)

Roe, Sir Thomas (Derby)

Rogers, F. N. (Wilts, Devizes)

Ropner, Colonel Sir E. H. O. R., Bt. (Stockton)

Rose, Charles D. (Cambridge, Newmarket)

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W. (Bucks, Aylesbury)

Rowlands, J. (Kent, Dartford)

Runciman, Walter (Dewsbury)

Russell, Thomas W. (Tyrone, S.)

Rutherford, John (Lancashire, N.E. Darwen)

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. (Middlesex, Brentford)

Rutherford, William W. (Liverpool, W. Derby)

S

Samuel, Herbert Louis (Yorkshire, Cleveland)

Samuel, Stuart M. (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel)

Sandys, Col. Thomas M. (Lancashire, Bootle)

Sassoon, Sir Edward A., Bt. (Hythe)

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hn. E. J. (Armagh, N.)

Scarisbrick, T. L. (Dorset, S.)

Schwann, C. D. (Cheshire, Hyde)

Schwann, Charles E. (Manchester, N.)

Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)

Scott, Sir Samuel E., Bt. (Marylebone, W.)

Sears, J. E. (Cheltenham)

Seaverns, J. H. (Lambeth, Brixton)

Seddon, J. R (Lancashire, S.W., Newton

Seely, Major J. E. B. (Liverpool, Abercromby)

Shackleton, David (Lancashire, N.E. Clitheroe)

Shaw, Charles Edward (Stafford)

Shaw, Rt. Hon. Thomas (Hawick Burghs)

Sheehan, Daniel D. (Cork Co., Mid)

Sheehy, David (Meath S.)

Shipman, Dr. John G. (Northampton)

Silcock, T. B. (Somerset, Wells)

Simon, J. A. (Essex, Walthamstow)

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John (Forfarshire)

Sloan, Thomas H. (Belfast, S.)

Smeaton, D. M. (Stirlingshire)

Smith, Abel Henry (Herts, Hertford)

Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)

Smith, Captain, M. K. (Warwickshire) Stratford-upon-Avon)

Smith, T. (Leitrim, S.)

Smith, Hon. W. Fred D. (Strand, Westminster)

Snowden, P. (Blackburn)

Soames, Arthur W. (Norfolk, S.)

Soares, Ernest J. (Devon, Barnstaple)

Spicer, A. (Hackney, Central)

Stanger, H. Y. (Kensington, N.)

Stanley, Hon. A. L. (Cheshire, Eddisbury)

Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Lancashire, S.W., Ormskirk)

Starkey, J. R. (Notts, Newark)

Steadman, W. C. (Finsbury, Central)

Stevenson, Francis S. (Suffolk, Eye)
Stewart, H. (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D., (Westmoreland, Kendal)
Stone, Sir John Benjamin (Birmingham, E.)
Strachey, Sir Edward Bt. (Somerset, S.)
Straus, B. S. (Tower Hamlets, Mile End)
Strauss, A. E. (Berks, Abingdon)
Stuart, J. (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath, S).
Summerbell, T. (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E. (Elgin Burghs)

T

Talbot, Lord Edmund (Sussex, Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hon. John G. (Oxford University)
Taylor, Austin (Liverpool, E. Toxteth)
Taylor, J. W. (Durham, Chester-le-Street)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe)
Tennant, E. P. (Salisbury)
Tennant, Harold John (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel, K.C. (Carmarthenshire, E.)
Thomas, Sir Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr Tydvil)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.)
Thorne, Will (West Ham, S.)
Thornton, Percy M. (Clapham)
Tillett, Louis John (Norwich)
Tomkinson, James (Cheshire, Crewe)
Torrance, A. M. (Glasgow, Central)
Toulmin, George (Bury, Lancashire)
Trevalyan, Charles P. (Yorks, W Elland)
Tuke, Sir John Batty (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities)
Turnour, Lord (Sussex, Horsham)

U

Ure, Alexander (Linlithgow)

V

Valentia, Rt. Hon. Lord (Oxford)
Verney, F. W. (Bucks, N.)
Villiers, Ernest Amherst (Brighton)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard (Sheffield, Central)
Vivian, Henry (Birkenhead)

W

Wadsworth, J. (York, W.R., Hallamshire)
Waldron, L. A. (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green)
Walker, H. de R. (Leicestershire, Melton)
Walker, Col. William H. (Lancashire, S.W., Widnes)
Wallace, Robert (Perth)
Walrond, Hon. L. (Devon, Tiverton)
Walsh, S. (Lancashire, S.W., Ince)
Walters, J. T. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Walton, Sir John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Yorks, W.R., Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke-on-Trent)
Ward, W. D. (Southampton)
Warde, Col. Charles E. (Kent, Medway)
Wardle, G. J. (Stockport)
Warner, T. Courtenay T. (Stafford, Lichfield)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan and Kinross)
Waterlow, D. S. (Islington, N.)
Watt, H. A. (Glasgow, College)
Wedgwood, J. C. (Newcastle-under-Lyme)
Weir, James Galloway (Ross and Cromarty)
Whitbread, S. H. (Hunts, Huntingdon)
White, George (Norfolk, N.W.)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (Yorks, E.R., Buckrose)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Whitehead, R. (Essex, S.E.)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W.R., Pudsey)

Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)

Whittaker, Thomas P. (Yorks, W.R., Spen Valley)

Wiles, Thomas (Islington, S.)

Wilkie, A. (Dundee)

Williams, A. Osmond (Merionethshire)

Williams, J. (Glamorgan, W.)

Williams, Colonel Robert (Dorset, W.)

Williams, W. L. (Carmarthen District)

Williamsson, A. (Elgin and Nairn)

Williamson, G. H. (Worcester)

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord (Lincolnshire, Horncastle)

Wills, A. W. (Dorset, N.)

Wilson, Arthur S. (Yorks, E.R., Holderness)

Wilson, Hon. Charles H. (Hull, W.)

Wilson, Henry Joseph (Yorks, W.R., Holmfirth)

Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Wilson, John William (Worcestershire, N.)

Wilson, P. Whitwell (St. Pancras, S.)

Wilson, W. T. (Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughten)

Winfrey, R. (Norfolk, S.W.)

Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid.)

Wood, T. MacKinnon (Glasgow, St. Rollox)

Woodhouse, Sir James T. (Huddersfield)

Wolff, Gustavus Wilhelm (Belfast, E.)

Wortley, Rt. Hon. Charles B. Stuart K.C. (Sheffield, Hallam)

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George (Dover)

Y

Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.)

Younger, G. (Ayr Burghs)

Yoxall, James Henry (Nottingham, W.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONSTITUENCIES,

WITH

NAMES OF MEMBERS.

(Compiled at the opening of the Session.)

ENGLAND AND WALES (495 Members).

Anglesey	Ellis Jones Griffith.
Ashton-under-Lyne	Alfred H. Scott.
Aston Manor	Evelyn Cecil.
Barrow-in-Furness	Charles Duncan.
Bath	Donald Maclean. George Peabody Gooch.
Battersea and Clapham—	
Battersea	Rt. Hon. John Burns.
Clapham	Percy Melville Thornton.
Bedford—	
Northern or Biggleswade	A. W. Black.
Southern or Luton	Thomas Gair Ashton.
Bedford	P. Barlow.
Berks—	
Northern or Abingdon	E. A. Strauss.
Southern or Newbury	F. C. Mackarness.
Eastern or Wokingham	Ernest Gardner.
Bethnal Green—	
North-East	Sir Edwin Andrew Cornwall.
South West	Edward Hare Pickersgill.
Birkenhead	Henry Vivian.

Birmingham—	
Edgbaston	Sir Francis William Lowe.
West	Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.
Central	Ebenezer Parkes.
North	John Throgmorton Middlemore.
East	Sir John Benjamin Stone.
Bordesley	Rt. Hon. Jesse Collings.
South	Viscount Morpeth.
Blackburn	Sir William Henry Hornby, Bt.
	Philip Snowden.
Bolton	George Harwood.
	A. H. Gill,
Boston	G. H. Faber.
Bradford—	
Central	Sir George Scott Robertson.
East	W. E. B. Priestly.
West	F. W. Jowett.
Brecknock	S. Robinson.
Brighton	Ernest Amhurst Villiers.
	Edward Aurelian Ridsdale.
Bristol—	
West	George Abraham Gibbs.
North	Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
East	Charles Edward Henry Hobhouse.
South	W. Howell Davies.
Bucks—	
Northern or Buckingham	Frederick W. Verney.
Mid or Aylesbury	Hon. Lionel Walter Rothschild.
Southern or Wycombe	T. Arnold Herbert.
Burnley	Frederick Maddison.
Bury (Lanc.)	George Toulmin.
Bury St. Edmunds	Capt. Fredk. William Fane Hervey.
Camberwell—	
North	Dr. Thomas James Macnamara.
Peckham	C. Goddard Clark.
Dulwich	Dr. F. Rutherfoord Harris.
Cambridge—	
Northern or Wisbech	A. C. Beck.
Western or Chesterton	E. S. Montagu.
Eastern or Newmarket	Charles Day Rose.
Cambridge	Stanley Owen Buckmaster, K.C.
Cambridge University	Samuel Henry Butcher.
	J. F. P. Rawlinson, K.C.
Canterbury	J. Henniker Heaton.

CARDIFF	Hon. Ivor Guest.
CARDIGAN	Matthew L. Vaughan Davies.
CARLISLE	F. W. Chance.
CARMARTHEN—	
Eastern	Abel Thomas, K.C.
Western	John Lloyd Morgan.
CARMARTHEN, &c.	William Llewellyn Williams.
CARNARVON—	
Southern or Eifion	John Bryn Roberts.
Northern or Arfon	William Jones.
CARNARVON, &c.	Rt. Hon. David Lloyd-George.
CHATHAM	J. Jenkins.
CHELSEA	Emslie John Horniman.
CHELTENHAM	John Edward Sears.
CHESTER—	
Wirral	W. H. Lever.
Eddisbury	Hon. A. L. Stanley.
Macclesfield	C. B. Brocklehurst.
Crewe	James Tomkinson.
Northwich	Sir John Tomlinson Brunner, Bt.
Altrincham	W. J. Crossley.
Hyde	C. D. Schwann.
Knutsford	Alfred John King.
CHESTER	Alfred Mond.
CHRISTCHURCH	Arthur Acland Allen.
COLCHESTER	Sir Weetman D. Pearson, Bt.
CORNWALL—	
Western or St. Ives	Clifford John Cory.
North-Western or Camborne	A. E. Dunn.
Truro	G. H. Morgan.
Mid or St. Austell	William Alexander McArthur.
South-Eastern or Bodmin	Hon. Thos. Chas. Reg. Agar-Robartes.
North-Eastern or Launceston	G. Croydon Marks.
COVENTRY	Alfred Edward Woodley Mason.
CROYDON	Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
CUMBERLAND—	
Northern or Eskdale	Hon. G. Howard.
Mid or Penrith	Rt. Hon. James William Lowther.
Cockermouth	Sir Wilfred Lawson, Bt.
Western or Egremont	H. Fullarton.
DARLINGTON	Herbert Pike Pease

DENBIGH—	
Eastern	Samuel Moss.
Western	John Herbert Roberts.
DENBIGH BOROUGHS	A. C. Edwards.
DEPTFORD	C. W. Bowerman.
DERBY—	
High Peak	Oswald Partington.
North Eastern	Thomas Dolling Bolton.
Chesterfield	J. Haslam.
Western	Rt. Hon. V. Cavendish.
Mid	James Alfred Jacoby.
Ilkeston	Rt. Hon. Sir B. Walter Foster.
Southern	Herbert H. Raphael.
DERBY	Richard Bell. Sir Thomas Roe.
DEVON—	
Eastern or Honiton	Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. Kennaway, Bt.
North-Eastern or Tiverton	Hon. Lionel Walrond.
Northern or South Molton	George Lambert.
North-Western or Barnstaple	Ernest J. Soares.
Western or Tavistock	Hugh Fownes Luttrell.
Southern or Totnes	Francis Bingham Mildmay.
Torquay	Francis Layland-Barratt.
Mid or Ashburton	Harry Trelawney, Eve, K.C.
DEVONPORT	Hudson E. Kearley. John Williams Benn.
DEWSBURY	Walter Runciman.
DORSET—	
Northern	A. W. Wills.
Eastern	Charles Henry Lyell.
Southern	T. L. Scarisbrick.
Western	Col. Robert Williams.
DOVER	Rt. Hon. George Wyndham.
DUDLEY	Arthur George Hooper.
DURHAM—	
Jarrow	Sir Charles Mark Palmer, Bt.
Houghton-le-Spring	Robert Cameron.
Chester-le-Street	John Wilkinson Taylor.
North-Western	Llewellyn A. Atherley Jones, K.C.
Mid	J. Wilson.
South-Eastern	Hon. Frederick Wm. Lambton.
Bishop Auckland	James Mellor Paulton.
Barnard Castle	Arthur Henderson.
DURHAM	John Walter Hills.

Essex—	
South-Western or Walthamstow	John Allsebrook Simon.
Southern or Romford	J. H. Bethell.
Western or Epping	Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R. M. Lockwood.
Northern or Saffron Walden	Joseph Albert Pease.
North-Eastern or Harwich	A. Levy Lever.
Eastern or Maldon	E. H. Bethell.
Mid or Chelmsford	Major Sir Fred. Carne Rasch, Bt.
South-Eastern	Rowland Whitehead.
Exeter	Sir George Kekewich, K.C.B.
Finsbury—	
Holborn	James Farquharson Remnant.
Central	William C. Steadman.
East	J. Allen Baker.
Flint	John Herbert Lewis.
Flint Boroughs	T. Howell Idris.
Fulham	Timothy Davies.
Gateshead	John Johnson.
Glamorgan—	
Eastern	Sir Alfred Thomas.
Rhondda	William Abraham.
Western or Gower	J. Williams.
Mid	Samuel Thomas Evans.
Southern	William Brace.
Gloucester—	
Mid or Stroud	Charles Peter Allen.
Northern or Tewkesbury	Hon. M. Hicks Beach.
Eastern or Cirencester	R. W. Essex.
Forest of Dean	Rt. Hn. Sir Chas. W. Dilke, Bt.
Southern or Thornbury	A. Rendall.
Gloucester	Russell Rea.
Grantham	Arthur Priestley.
Gravesend	Sir Gilbert Parker.
Greenwich	Richard Stephen Jackson.
Gt. Grimsby	Sir George Doughty.
Gt. Yarmouth	Arthur Fell.
Hackney—	
North	T. H. Davies.
Central	Albert Spicer.
South	Horatio W. Bottomley.
Halifax	John Henry Whiteley. J. Parker.
Hammersmith	Sir William James Bull.

HAMPSTEAD	J. S. Fletcher.
HANLEY	Enoch Edwards.
HANTS—	
Northern or Basingstoke	
Western or Andover	Capt. W. V. Faber.
Eastern or Petersfield	William Graham Nicholson.
Southern or Fareham	Arthur Hamilton Lee.
New Forest	Sir Robert Hobart.
HARTLEPOOL	Sir Christopher Furness.
HASTINGS	Harvey Du Cros.
HEREFORD—	
Northern or Leominster	Edmund Lamb.
Southern or Ross	Col. Alan Gardner.
HEREFORD	John Stanhope Arkwright.
HERTFORD—	
Northern or Hitchin	J. Bertram.
Eastern or Hertford	Abel Henry Smith.
Mid or St. Albans	E. H. Carlile.
Western or Watford	Nathaniel Micklem, K.C.
HUDDERSFIELD	Sir James Thomas Woodhouse.
HUNTINGDON—	
Southern or Huntingdon	S. Howard Whitbread.
Northern or Ramsey	A. C. Forster Boulton.
HYTHE	Sir Edward A. Sassoon, Bt.
IPSWICH	Daniel Ford Goddard. Felix Thornley Cobbold.
ISLINGTON—	
North	D. S. Waterlow.
West	Thomas Lough.
East	G. H. Radford.
South	Thomas Wiles.
KENSINGTON—	
North	Henry York Stanger, K.C.
South	Lord Percy.
KENT—	
Western or Sevenoaks	Henry William Forster.
North-Western or Dartford	James Rowlands.
South-Western or Tunbridge	A. P. Hedges.
Mid or Medway	Col. Charles Edw. Warde.
North-Eastern or Faversham	T. B. Napier.
Southern or Ashford	Laurence Hardy.
Eastern or St. Augustine's	Rt. Hon. Aretas Akers-Douglas.
Isle of Thanet	H. H. Marks.
KIDDERMINSTER	Edmund Broughton Barnard.

KINGSTON-ON-HULL—	
East	Thomas R. Ferens.
Central	Sir Henry Seymour King, K.C.I.E.
West	Hon. Charles Henry Wilson.
LAMBETH—	
North	Horatio Myer.
Kennington	Stephen Collings.
Brixton	J. H. Seaverns.
Norwood	G. Stewart Bowles.
LANCASTER, NORTH—	
North Lonsdale	George B. Haddock.
Lancaster	Norval Watson Helme.
Blackpool	W. W. Ashley.
Chorley	Lord Balcarres.
LANCASTER, NORTH-EAST—	
Darwen	John Rutherford.
Clitheroe	David James Shackleton.
Accrington	Sir Joseph Francis Leese.
Rossendale	Rt. Hon. Lewis Harcourt.
LANCASTER, SOUTH-EAST—	
Westhoughton	W. T. Wilson.
Heywood	Edward Hopkinson Holden.
Middleton	W. R. Adkins.
Radcliffe-cum-Farnworth	Theodore Cook Taylor.
Eccles	Dr. G. H. Pollard.
Stretford	H. Nuttall.
Gorton	John Hodge.
Prestwich	Frederick Cawley.
LANCASTER, SOUTH-WEST—	
Southport	John Meir Astbury, K.C.
Ormskirk	Hon. Arthur Stanley, C.V.O.
Bootle	Colonel Thomas M. Sandys.
Widnes	Col. William Hall Walker.
Newton	James R. Seddon.
Ince	S. Walsh.
Leigh	John Fowler Leece Brunner.
LEEDS—	
North	Rowland Hirst Barran.
Central	Robert Armitage.
East	J. O'Grady.
West	Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone.
South	Sir John Lawson Walton, K.C.
LEEK DIVISION, *see* Stafford.	
LEICESTER—	
Eastern or Melton	H. de R. Walker.
Mid or Loughborough	Maurice Levy.
Western or Bosworth	Sir Charles B. Bright McLaren, Bt.
Southern or Harborough	Rudulph Chambers Lehmann.
LEICESTER	Henry Broadhurst. James Ramsey Macdonald.

LEWISHAM	Major Edward Feetham Coates.
LINCOLN—	
West Lindsay or Gainbsorough	Major Leslie Renton.
North Lindsay or Brigg	Harold James Reckitt.
Easy Llndsey or Louth	Robert William Perks.
South Lindsey or Horncastle	Lord Willoughby de Eresby.
North Kesteven or Sleaford	Arnold Lupton.
South Kesteven or Stamford	Lord J. Joicey-Cecil.
Holland or Spalding	Horace Rendall Mansfield.
LINCOLN	Charles H. Roberts.
LIVERPOOL—	
Kirkdale	David MacIver.
Walton	Frederick Edwin Smith.
Everton	J. S. Harmood-Banner.
West Derby	William Watson Rutherford.
Scotland	Thomas P. O'Connor.
Exchange	Richard Robert Cherry, K.C.
Abercromby	Major J. E. B. Seely.
East Toxteth	Austin Taylor.
West Toxteth	Robert P. Houston.
LONDON	Sir Edward G. Clarke, K.C. Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour
LONDON UNIVERSITY	Sir Philip Magnus.
LYNN REGIS	Carlyon Bellairs.
MAIDSTONE	Lord Castlereagh.
MANCHESTER—	
East	Thomas Gardiner Horridge, K.C.
North	Charles E. Schwann.
North-East	J. R. Clynes.
North-West	Winston L. S. Churchill
South	Arthur Arlington Haworth.
South-West	George D. Kelley.
MARYLEBONE—	
East	Lord Robert Cecil, K.C.
West	Sir Samuel Edward Scott, Bt.
MERIONETH	Arthur Osmond-Williams.
MERTHYR TYDVIL	David Alfred Thomas. James Keir Hardie.
MIDDLESBROUGH	Joseph Havelock Wilson.
MIDDLESEX—	
Enfield	James Branch.
Tottenham	Percy Alden.
Hornsey	Capt. C. B. Balfour.
Harrow	James Gibb.
Ealing	Herbert Nield.
Brentford	Dr. V. H. Rutherford.
Uxbridge	Sir Fred. D. Dixon-Hartland, Bt.

MONMOUTH—	
Northern	Reginald McKenna.
Western	Tom Richards.
Southern	Col. John Ivor Caradoc Herbert.
MONMOUTH, &c.	L. Haslam.
MONTGOMERY	David Davies.
MONTGOMERY, &c.	J. D. Rees.
MORPETH	Rt. Hon. Thomas Burt.
NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME	Josiah Clement Wedgwood.
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE	W. Hudson. T. Cairns.
NEWINGTON—	
Walworth	C. J. O'Donnell.
West	Captain Cecil Wm. Norton.
NORFOLK—	
North-Western	George White.
South-Western	R. Winfrey.
Northern	Sir William Brampton Gurdon.
Eastern	Robert John Price.
Mid	Lord Wodehouse.
Southern	Arthur W. Soames.
NORTHAMPTON—	
Northern	George Nicholls.
Eastern	Francis Allston Channing.
Mid	H. Manfield.
Southern	T. N. A. Grove.
NORTHAMPTON	Herbert W. Paul. Dr. John Greenwood Shipman.
NORTHUMBERLAND—	
Wansbeck	Charles Fenwick.
Tyneside	J. M. Robertson.
Hexham	Wentworth C. Blackett Beaumont.
Berwick-upon-Tweed	Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt.
NORWICH	G. H. Roberts. Louis John Tillett.
NOTTINGHAM—	
Bassetla	F. Newnes.
Newark	J. R. Starkey.
Rushcliffe	Rt. Hon. John Edward Ellis.
Mansfield	Arthur B. Markham.
NOTTINGHAM—	
West	James Henry Yoxall.
East	Sir Henry John Stedman Cotton.
South	Arthur Richardson.
OLDHAM	Alfred Emmott. J. A. Bright.
OXFORD—	
Northern or Banbury	Hon. Eustace E. Fiennes.
Mid or Woodstock	E. N. Bennett.
Southern or Henley	Phillip Morell.

OXFORD	Viscount Valentia.
OXFORD UNIVERSITY	Sir William Reynell Anson, Bt. Rt. Hon. John Gilbert Talbot.
PADDINGTON—	
North	L. G. Chiozza-Money.
South	Sir T. George Fardell.
PEMBROKE	John Wynford Phillips.
PEMBROKE AND HAVERFORDWEST	O. C. Phillips.
PENRYN AND FALMOUTH	John Barker.
PETERBOROUGH	Granville George Greenwood.
PLYMOUTH	T. W. Dobson. Charles E. Mallet.
PONTEFRACT	Thomas Willans Nussey.
PORTSMOUTH	Thomas Arthur Bramsdon. Sir John Baker.
PRESTON	John Thomas MacPherson Harold Cox.
RADNOR	Frank Edwards.
READING	Rufus Daniel Isaacs, K.C.
ROCHDALE	A. G. C. Harvey.
ROCHESTER	Ernest H. Lamb.
RUTLAND	Rt. Hon. George Henry Finch.
ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER SQUARE	Col. Hon. Heneage Legge.
ST. HELENS	Thomas Glover.
ST. PANCRAS—	
North	Willoughby Hyett Dickinson.
East	Hugh Cecil Lea.
West	Sir William Job Collins.
South	P. Whitwell Wilson.
SALFORD—	
North	William Pollard Byles.
South	Hilaire J. P. R. Belloc.
West	George William Agnew.
SALISBURY	Edward Priaulx Tennant.
SCARBOROUGH	Walter Russell Rea.
SHEFFIEDD—	
Attercliffe	J. Batty Langley.
Brightside	John Tudor Walters.
Central	Col. Sir C. E. H. Vincent, K.C.M.G., C.
Hallam	Rt. Hon. Chas. B. Stuart Wortley.
Ecclesall	Samuel Roberts.

SHOREDITCH—	
Hoxton	Hon. Claude George D. Hay.
Haggerston	William Randall Cremer.
SHREWSBURY	Sir Clement Lloyd Hill.
SHROPSHIRE—	
Western or Oswestry	W. Clive Bridgeman.
Northern or Newport	Rt. Hon. Col. William Kenyon Slaney.
Mid or Wellington	C. S. Henry.
Southern or Ludlow	Rowland Hunt.
SOMERSET—	
Northern	W. H. B. Hope.
Wells	Thomas Ball Silcock.
Frome	John Emmott Barlow
Eastern	J. W. H. Thompson.
Southern	Sir Edward Strachey, Bt.
Bridgwater	H. G. Montgomery.
Western or Wellington	Rt. Hon. Sir A. F. Acland Hood, Bt.
SOUTHAMPTON	Lt.-Col. Ivor Philipps. William Dudley Ward.
SOUTH SHIELDS	Sir William Snowdon Robson.
SOUTHWARK—	
West	Rt. Hon. Richard Knight Causton.
Rotherhithe	Hubert W. Carr-Gomm.
Bermondsey	Dr. George Cooper.
STAFFORD—	
Leek	Robert Pearce.
Burton	Robert F. Ratcliffe.
Western	H. D. McLaren.
North-Western	A. Billson.
Lichfield	Thomas Courtenay T. Warner.
Kingswinford	H. Staveley Hill.
Handsworth	E. C. Meysey-Thompson.
STAFFORD	Charles Edward Shaw.
STALYBRIDGE	J. F. Cheetham.
STOCKPORT	G. J. Wardle. James Duckworth.
STOCKTON	Col. Sir E. H. O. Robert Ropner, Bt.
STOKE-UPON-TRENT	John Ward.
STRAND (Westminster)	Hon. W. F. Danvers Smith.
SUFFOLK—	
Northern or Lowestoft	H. W. Beauchamp.
North-Eastern or Eye	Francis S. Stevenson.
North-Western or Stowmarket	George A. Hardy.
South or Sudbury	W. C. Heaton-Armstong.
South-Eastern or Woodbridge	Robert Lacey Everett.

SUNDERLAND	James Stuart. T. Summerbell.
SURREY—	
North Western or Chertsey	F. J. Marnham.
South-Western or Guildford	W. H. Cowan.
South-Eastern or Reigate	H. C. Brodie.
Mid or Epsom	William Keswick.
Kingston	George Cave, K.C.
North-Eastern or Wimbledon	Charles Eric Hambro.
SUSSEX—	
North-Western or Horsham	Lord Turnour.
South-Western or Chichester	Lord Edmund Talbot.
Northern or East Grinstead	C. H. Corbett.
Mid or Lewes	Rt. Hon. Sir Hy. Aubrey Fletcher, Bt.
Southern or Eastbourne	Hubert Beaumont.
Eastern or Rye	George Loyd Courthope.
SWANSEA—	
Town	Sir George Newnes, Bt.
District	David Brynmor Jones.
TAUNTON	Sir E. Boyle, Bt., K.C.
TOWER HAMLETS—	
Whitechapel	Stuart Montagu Samuel.
St. George's	W. Wedgwood Benn.
Limehouse	William Pearce.
Mile End	Bertram S. Straus.
Stepney	Major Sir William E. Evans Gordon.
Bow and Bromley	G. Stopford Brooke.
Poplar	Rt. Hon. Sydney Charles Buxton.
TYNEMOUTH	Herbert J. Craig.
WAKEFIELD	Edward Allen Brotherton.
WALSALL	Major Edward Martin Dunn.
WANDSWORTH	Sir Henry Kimber, Bt.
WARRINGTON	Arthur H. Crosfield.
WARWICK—	
Northern or Tamworth	Sir Philip Albert Muntz, Bt.
North-Eastern or Nuneaton	William Johnson.
South-West. or Stratford-on-Avon	Capt. M. K. Smith.
South-Eastern or Rugby	Corrie Grant.
WARWICK AND LEAMINGTON	Thomas Henry Devereux Berridge.
WEDNESBURY	Clarendon Golding Hyde.
WEST BROMWICH	Dr. Alfred Ernest W. Hazel.
WEST HAM—	
North	Charles Fredk. Gurney Masterman.
South	Will Thorne.

WESTMINSTER	W. L. Ashmead B. Burdett-Coutts.
WESTMORELAND—	
Northern or Appleby	Leif Jones.
Southern or Kendal	D. Stewart-Smith, K.C.
WHITEHAVEN	W. J. Dalzell Burnyeat.
WIGAN	Sir Francis Sharpe Powell, Bt.
WIGHT, ISLE OF	Godfrey Baring.
WILTS—	
Northern or Cricklade	Dr. John Massie.
North-Western or Chippenham	Sir John Dickson Poynder, Bt.
Western or Westbury	John Michael Fleetwood Fuller.
Eastern or Devizes	F. N. Rogers.
Southern or Wilton	L. L. Morse.
WINCHESTER	Hon. Guy Victor Baring.
WINDSOR	James Francis Mason.
WOLVERHAMPTON—	
West	T. F. Richards.
East	Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler, G.C.S.I.
South	Henry Norman.
WOOLWICH	William Crooks.
WORCESTER—	
West or Bewdley	Alfred Baldwin.
South or Evesham	Col. Charles Wigram Long.
Mid or Droitwich	C. B. Harmsworth
Northern	John William Wilson.
Eastern	Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain.
WORCESTER	George Henry Williamson.
YORK. NORTH RIDING—	
Thirsk and Malton	Lord Helmsley
Richmond	Francis Dyke Acland.
Cleveland	Herbert Louis Samuel.
Whitby	Hon. Gervase Beckett.
YORK, EAST RIDING—	
Holderness	Arthur Stanley Wilson.
Buckrose	Luke White.
Howdenshire	Col. Henry Broadley-Harrison-Broadley.
YORK, WEST RIDING—	
Skipton	W. Clough.
Keighley	John Brigg.
Shipley	Percy Illingworth.
Sowerby	John Sharp Higham.
Elland	Charles Philips Trevelyn.
Morley	Alfred Eddison Hutton.
Normanton	F. Hall.
Colne Valley	Sir James Kitson, Bt.

York, West Riding—*continued.*	
Holmfirth	Henry Joseph Wilson.
Barnsley	Joseph Walton.
Hallamshire	J. Wadsworth.
Rotherham	Sir Henry William Holland.
Doncaster	Charles Norris Nicholson.
Ripon	H. F. B. Lynch.
Otley	James Hastings Duncan.
Barkston Ash	George Lane-Fox.
Osgoldcross	J. Compton Rickett.
Pudsey	George Whiteley.
Spen Valley	Thomas Palmer Whittaker.
York	Hamar Greenwood. George Denison Faber.

SCOTLAND (72 Members.)

Aberdeen—	
East	James Annand.
West	J. McD. Henderson.
Aberdeen—	
North	Duncan Vernon Pirie.
South	Rt. Hon. James Bryce.
Argyll	John Stirling Ainsworth.
Ayr—	
North	Hon. Thomas H. Cochrane.
South	W. P. Beale, K.C.
Ayr Burghs	George Younger.
Banff	Alexander William Black.
Berwick	Harold John Tennant.
Bute	Norman Lamont.
Caithness	Robert Leicester Harmsworth.
Clackmannan & Kinross	Eugene Wason.
Dumbarton	J. D. White.
Dumfries	P. A. Molteno.
Dumfries, &c.	J. W. Gulland.
Dundee	Rt. Hon. Edmund Robertson, K.C. A. Wilkie.
Edinburgh (Midlothian)	Lord Dalmeny.

EDINBURGH—	
East	George McCrae.
West	Sir Lewis McIver, Bt.
Central	Charles E. Price.
South	Arthur Dewar, K.C.
EDINBURGH and ST. ANDREWS Universities	Sir J. Batty Tuke.
ELGIN AND NAIRN	A. Williamson.
ELGIN, BANFF, &c.	J. E. Sutherland.
FALKIRK, &c.	J. A. Murray Macdonald.
FIFE—	
Eastern	Rt. Hon. Herbert H. Asquith.
Western	John Deans Hope.
FORFAR	Rt. Hon. John Sinclair.
GLASGOW—	
Bridgeton	J. W. Cleland.
Camlachie	Alexander Cross.
St. Rollox	T. McKinnon Wood.
Central	A. M. Torrance.
College	H. A. Watt.
Tradeston	A. Cameron Corbett.
Blackfriars and Hutchesontown	J. N. Barnes.
GLASGOW and ABERDEEN Universities	Sir H. Craik.
GREENOCK	Halley Stuart.
HADDINGTON	Rt. Hon. Richard B. Haldane, K.C.
HAWICK, &c.	Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, K.C.
INVERNESS	John Alexander Dewar.
INVERNESS, &c.	J. Annan Bryce.
KILMARNOCK, &c.	A. R. Rainy.
KINCARDINE	John William Crombie.
KIRKCALDY, &c.	James H. Dalziel.
KIRKCUDBRIGHT	Major G. McMicking.
LANARK—	
Govan	R. Duncan.
Partick	R. Balfour.
North Western	William Mitchell-Thomson.
North-Eastern	Alexander Findlay.
Mid	James Caldwell.
Southern	W. Menzies.
LEITH, &c.,	Ronald C. Munro Ferguson.

Linlithgow	Alexander Ure.
Montrose, &c.	Rt. Hon. John Morley.
Orkney & Shetland	J. Cathcart Wason.
Paisley	John McCallum.
Peebles & Selkirk	Master of Elibank.
Perth—	
Eastern	Thomas Ryburn Buchanan.
Western	D. C. Erskine.
Perth	Robert Wallace.
Renfrew—	
Eastern	R. Laidlaw.
Western	Sir T. Glen-Coats, Bt.
Ross & Cromartie	James Galloway Weir.
Roxburgh	Sir John Jardine.
St. Andrews, &c.	Major Anstruther-Gray.
Stirling	Donald McKenzie Smeaton.
Stirling. &c.	Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Sutherland	Alpheus Cleophas Morton.
Wick, &c.	Sir Arthur Bignold.
Wigton	Lord Dalrymple.

IRELAND (103 Members).

Antrim—	
North	R. Glendinning.
Mid	Hon. Rob. Torrens O'Neill.
East	Colonel James McCalmont.
South	Charles Curtis Craig.
Armagh—	
North	Col. Rt. Hn. Edw. Jas. Saunderson.
Mid	John Brownlee Lonsdale.
South	W. McKillop.
Belfast—	
East	Gustavus Wilhelm Wolff.
South	Thomas Henry Sloan.
West	J. Devlin.
North	Rt. Hon. Sir D. Dixon.
Carlow	John Hammond.

CAVAN—	
West	Vincent Paul Kennedy.
East	Samuel Young.
CLARE—	
East	William H. K. Redmond.
West	J. Halpin.
CORK—	
North	James Christopher Flynn.
North-East	William Abraham.
Mid	Daniel Daniel Sheehan.
East	Capt. A. J. C. Donelan.
West	James Gilhooly.
South	Edward Barry.
South-East	Eugene Crean.
CORK	William O'Brien. Augustine Roche.
DONEGAL—	
North	P. O'Doherty.
West	Hugh A. Law.
East	C. McVeigh.
South	J. G. Swift McNeill, K.C.
DOWN—	
North	Thomas Lorimer Corbett.
East	Captain James Craig.
South	Jeremiah MacVeagh.
West	H. Liddell.
DUBLIN—	
North	John J. Clancy.
South	Rt. Won. Walter H. Long.
DUBLIN—	
College Green	Joseph Patrick Nannetti.
Dublin Harbour	Timothy C. Harrington.
St. Stephen's Green	Lawrence Ambrose Waldron.
St. Patrick's	William Field.
DUBLIN UNIVERSITY	Right Hon, Sir E. H. Carson. Rt. Hon. J. H. M. Campbell.
FERMANAGH—	
North	G. Fetherstonhaugh.
South	Jeremiah Jordan.
GALWAY—	
Connemara	William O'Malley.
North	
East	John Roche.
South	William J. Duffy.
GALWAY	Charles R. Devlin.

KERRY—	
North	Michael Joseph Flavin
West	Thomas O'Donnell.
South	John P. Boland.
East	John Murphy.
KILDARE—	
North	John O'Connor.
South	Dennis Kilbride.
KILKENNY—	
North	Joseph Devlin.
South	James O'Mara.
KILKENNY	Patrick O'Brien.
KINGS CO.—	
Birr	Michael Reddy.
Tullamore	Edmund Haviland Burke.
LEITRIM—	
North	Patrick A. McHugh.
South	T. Smith.
LIMERICK—	
West	Patrick Joseph O'Shaughnessy.
East	William Lundon.
LIMERICK	Michael Joyce.
LONDONDERRY—	
North	H. T. Barrie.
South	John Gordon, K.C.
LONDONDERRY	Marquis of Hamilton.
LONGFORD—	
North	James Patrick Farrell.
South	Hon. Edward Blake, K.C.
LOUTH—	
North	Timothy M. Healy.
South	Joseph Nolan.
MAYO—	
North	Conor O'Kelly.
West	Dr. R. Ambrose.
East	John Dillon.
South	John O'Donnell.
MEATH—	
North	Patrick White.
South	David Sheehy.
MONAGHAN—	
North	P. O'Hara.
South	J. McKean.
NEWRY	J. J. Mooney.

QUEEN'S CO.	
Ossory	William Delany.
Leix	P. A. Meehan.
ROSCOMMON—	
North	James O'Kelly.
South	John P. Hayden.
SLIGO—	
North	P. A. McHugh.
South	John O'Dowd.
TIPPERARY—	
North	Michael Hogan.
Mid	Kendal E. O'Brien.
South	John Cullinan.
East	Thomas Joseph Condon.
TYRONE—	
North	Sergt. W. H. Dodd.
Mid	George Murnaghan.
East	Patrick C. Doogan.
South	Thomas W. Russell.
WATERFORD—	
West	James John O'Shee.
East	Patrick Joseph Power.
WATERFORD	John E. Redmond.
WESTMEATH—	
North	L. Ginnell.
South	Donal Sullivan.
WEXFORD—	
North	Sir T. H. Gratton Esmonde.
South	Peter Ffrench.
WICKLOW—	
West	James O'Connor.
East	Denis J. Cogan.

SUMMARY.

	No. of Members	
ENGLAND		
Counties...	234	
Metropolitan Boroughs...	62	
Provincial Cities and Boroughs	164	
		46
WALES		
Counties...	19	
Boroughs	11	
		3
SCOTLAND		
Counties...	39	
Cities and Burghs	31	
		7
IRELAND		
Counties ...	85	
Cities and Boroughs	16	
		10
UNIVERSITIES		
England ...	5	
Scotland ...	2	
Ireland ...	2	
Total number of Members		67

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLII.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION, 1906.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

PARLIAMENT.—Opened by Commission; and the Commons (who were sent for) being at the Bar, were directed to proceed to the choice of a Speaker, and to present such Person whom they should so choose here To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock, for His Majesty's Royal Approbation 1

SAT FIRST.

Several Lords took the oath 1

LORD CHANCELLOR.—The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*) acquainted the House that His Majesty had been pleased to create the Right Hon. Sir Robert Threshie Reid, G.C.M.G., Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, a Peer of this Realm, by the title of Baron Loreburn of Dumfries, in the county of Dumfries, and his Lordship, having retired to robe, was introduced in the usual manner 1

CERTIFICATE OF THE ELECTION OF SIXTEEN REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.—Delivered and read 2

ROLL OF THE LORDS.—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of the United Kingdom. The same was ordered to lie on the Table 2

SAT FIRST.

Several Lords took the oath.

CECIL GEORGE SAVILE BARON HAWKESBURY, Lord Steward of His Majesty's Household, having been created Viscount Hawkesbury of Kirkham, in the county of York, and of Mansfield, in the county of Nottingham, and Earl of Liverpool, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

CHARLES ROBERT SPENCER, Lord Chamberlain of His Majesty's Household, having been created Viscount Althorp of Great Brington, in the county of Northampton, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Feb. 13.] Page

The EARL CATHCART sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The LORD CAMOYS sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

ROBERT GEORGE BARON WINDSOR, having been created Viscount Windsor of Saint Fagans, in the county of Glamorgan, and Earl of Plymouth, in the county of Devon, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

EDWARD CECIL BARON IVEAGH, K.P., having been created Viscount Iveagh of Iveagh, in the county of Down, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The LORD KINROSS sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

ALEXANDER JOHN FORBES-LEITH, Esquire, having been created Baron Leith of Fyvie, of Fyvie, in the county of Aberdeen, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The RIGHT HON. JOHN ATKINSON, having been appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary under the provisions of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, with the dignity of a Baron for life, by the style and title of Baron Atkinson of Glenwilliam, in the county of Limerick. was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SIR THOMAS HENRY SANDERSON, G.C.B., K.C.M.G., I.S.O., having been created Baron Sanderson of Armthorpe, in the county of York, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SIR HENRY MEYSEY MEYSEY-THOMPSON, Baronet, having been created Baron Knaresborough of Kirby Hall, in the county of York, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SIR HERBERT STERN, Baronet, having been created Baron Michelham of Hellingly, in the county of Sussex, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath .. ..

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock. And, it being the first day of the meeting of this Parliament, pursuant to a Proclamation, Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., Clerk of the House of Commons, Arthur William Nicholson, esquire, and Thomas Lonsdale Webster, esquire, Clerks Assistant, attending in the House, and the other Clerks attending according to their duty, Sir Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie, K.C.B., Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Great Britain, delivered to the said Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., a Book containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

Several of the Members repaired to their seats.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners by Black Rod.

The House went; and a Commission having been read for opening and holding the Parliament, the Lords Commissioners directed the House to proceed to the Election of a Speaker, and to present him To-morrow, at Twelve of the Clock, in the House of Peers for the Royal Approbation.

And the House being returned;

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Baronet, stood up, and addressed himself to the Clerk of the House (who standing up, pointed to him, and then sat down).

Election of Speaker.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson (*Cumberland, Cockermouth*) 4
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 6

Moved, "That the right hon. James William Lowther do take the Chair of this House as Speaker."

Mr. J. W. Lowther (*Cumberland, Penrith*) 8

The House then having again unanimously called Mr. James William Lowther to the Chair, he was taken out of his place and conducted to the Chair by Sir Wilfrid Lawson and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Mr. Speaker-Elect then took his seat in the Chair and the Sergeant-at-Arms placed the Mace on the Table.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman* (*Stirling Burghs*) 10
Mr. Akers-Douglas (*Kent, St. Augustine's*) 11
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 12

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. Speaker-Elect thereupon put the Question, which being agreed to, the House adjourned accordingly until to-morrow, and Mr. Speaker-Elect went away without the Mace before him.

House adjourned at five minutes before Three o'clock until Twelve o'clock To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—The Lords Commissioners being seated in front of the throne and the Commons being sent for:—

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT submitted himself for His Majesty's Gracious Approbation 13

Several Lords took the oath.

Sir Alfred Charles William Harmsworth, Baronet, having been created Baron Northcliffe of the Isle of Thanet, in the county of Kent, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edmund Beckett Faber, esquire, having been created Baron Faber of Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

William Henry Grenfell, esquire, having been created Baron Desborough of Taplow, in the county of Buckingham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edmond George Petty Fitzmaurice, esquire, commonly called Lord Edmond George Petty Fitzmaurice, having been created Baron Fitzmaurice of Leigh, in the county of Wilts, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Newlands sat first in Parliament after the death of his father. .. 14

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.—Writs and Returns electing the Earl of Wicklow a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Earl of Lanesborough, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto; delivered (on oath), and certificate read. .. 14

Several Lords took the oath.

The right hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, Baronet, having been created Viscount St. Aldwyn of Coln St. Aldwyn, in the county of Gloucester, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The right hon. Sir Arthur Divett Hayter, Baronet, having been created Baron Haversham of Bracknell, in the county of Berks, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The right hon. Charles Hare Hemphill having been created Baron Hemphill of Rathkenny and of Cashell, in the county of Tipperary, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took oath.

Sir James Joicey, Baronet, having been created Baron Joicey of Chester-le-Street, in the county of Durham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Charles Henry Wilson, esquire, having been created Baron Nunburnholme of the city of Kingston-upon-Hull, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir William Henry Wills, Baronet, having been created Baron Winterstoke of Blagdon, in the county of Somerset, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Lord Bishop of Oxford took the oath 14

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock, to Friday next, half-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the clock, and Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT having taken the Chair.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners by Black Rod.

The House went; and, being returned—

Mr. SPEAKER reported, That the House had been in the House of Peers, where His Majesty was pleased by His Majesty's Commissioners to approve of the choice the House had made of him to be their Speaker, and that he had in their name and on their behalf by humble petition to His Majesty made claim to their ancient and undoubted rights and privileges, particularly to freedom from arrest and all molestation of their persons, to freedom of speech in debate, to free access to His Majesty when occasion shall require, and that the most favourable construction should be put upon all their proceedings; which he said His Majesty, by his said Commissioners, had confirmed to them in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted or allowed by His Majesty, or any of his Royal predecessors.

And then Mr. SPEAKER repeated his very respectful acknowledgments and grateful thanks to the House for the great honour they had done him.

Mr. SPEAKER then put the House in mind that their first duty was to take and subscribe the oath required by law.

Thereupon Mr. SPEAKER first alone, standing upon the upper step of the Chair, took and subscribed the oath.

Then several Members took and subscribed the oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the affirmation required by law 1

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Four o'clock.

Feb. 15.] Page

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 15th FEBRUARY, 1906.

TOOK THE OATH.—Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the affirmation required by law 18

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, " That this House do now adjourn till Monday next,"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to 18

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-three minutes after Four o'clock until Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 16th FEBRUARY, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath 20

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 19th FEBRUARY, 1906.

THE KING'S SPEECH.—THE KING, being seated on the Throne, and the Commons being at the Bar with their Speaker, His Majesty was pleased to make a most gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and then retired 21

Several Lords took the Oath.

The LORD LEIGH sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The right hon. SIR WILLIAM HOOD WALROND, baronet, having been created Baron Waleran of Uffculme, in the county of Devon, was (in the usual manner introduced.

PHILIP JAMES STANHOPE, esquire, commonly called the hon. Philip James Stanhope, having been created Baron Weardale of Stanhope, in the county of Durham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

CHARLES LORD BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The EARL CAIRNS sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

Several Lords took the oath 24

SELECT VESTRIES.—Bill, pro formâ, read 1ª 24

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The Marquess of Northampton 25
Lord Herschell 30

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty thanking him for his gracious Speech from the Throne."—(*The Marquess of Northampton.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 36
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 47
The Marquess of Salisbury 61
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 63

On Question, agreed to *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW.—Appointed *nemine dissentiente* to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this session.

Committee for Privileges, appointed.

Committee for the Journals, appointed.

Stoppages in the Streets, order to prevent, renewed.

Appeal Committee, appointed.

ROLL OF THE LORDS.—The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table. The same was ordered to be printed. (No. 1.)

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had received (by post) from the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland, and had laid upon the Table, minutes of the meeting held on the 30th of January last of the Peers of Scotland for the election of their representatives to sit and vote in the ensuing Parliament of the United Kingdom; and also, return by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland concerning titles of peerages called at the said meeting in right of which respectively no vote had been received and counted for fifty years last past at the date of the said meeting. Ordered, that the said minutes of election, etc., be printed. (No. 2.) 66

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz. :— 66

TREATY SERIES:

No. 20 (1905). Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting Extra-territorial Jurisdiction in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 25th February, 1905. (August 29.)

No. 21 (1905). Accession of Mexico to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 13th March, 1905. (August 29.)

Feb. 19.] *Page*

No. 22 (1905). Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the Junction of the Chinese and Burmese Telegraph Lines, being a revision of the Convention of 6th September, 1894. Signed at Pekin, 23rd May, 1905. (August 30.)

No. 23 (1905). Declarations between the United Kingdom and Greece with respect to Commercial Matters, Signed at Athens, 10th (23) November, 1904, and 4th (17) May, 1905. (September 2.)

No. 24 (1905). International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic. Signed at Paris, 18th May, 1904. (September 9.)

No. 25 (1905.) Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905. (September 26.)

No. 26 (1905). Parcel Post Agreement between the United Kingdom and Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, 28th July, 1905. (September 29.)

No. 27 (1905). Agreement between the United Kingdom and France, relative to the Arbitral Tribunal contemplated by Article III. of the Convention of 8th April, 1904, respecting Newfoundland. Signed at London, 7th April, 1905. (October 28.) 67

COLONIES—I. ANNUAL SERIES :—

No. 454. Turks and Caicos Islands (Report for 1904). (August 19.)

No. 455. British Honduras (Report for 1904). (September 2.)

No. 456. Seychelles (Report for 1904). (September 7.)

No. 457. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast (Report for 1904). (September 8.)

No. 458. Straits Settlements (Report for 1904). (September 16.)

No. 459. Southern Nigeria (Report for 1904). (September 18.)

No. 460. Sierra Leone (Report for 1904). (September 18.)

No. 461. British Solomon Islands (Report for 1903–1904 and 1904–1905). (September 30.)

No. 462. Malta (Report for 1904–1905). (October 9.)

No. 463. Granada (Report for 1904). (October 18.)

No. 464. St. Vincent (Report for 1904). (October 13.)

No. 465. Gold Coast (Report for 1904). (October 18.)

No. 466. Barbados (Report for 1904–1905). (October 20.)

No. 467. Uganda (Report for 1904–1905). (October 31.)

No. 468. Somaliland (Report for 1904–1905). (November 3.)

No. 469. Trinidad and Tobago (Report for 1904–1905). (November 4.)

No. 470. Lagos (Report for 1904). (November 7.)

No. 471. Bahamas (Report for 1904–1905). (November 8.)

No. 472. British Central Africa Protectorate (Report for 1904–1905). (November 8.)

Feb. 19.] *Page*

No. 473. Mauritius (Report for 1904). (November 10.)

No. 474. Fiji (Report for 1904). (November 14.)

No. 475. British East Africa Protectorate (Report for 1904–1905). (November 21.)

No. 476. Northern Nigeria (Report for 1904). (November 21.)

No. 477. British Guiana (Report for 1904–1905). (November 22.)

No. 478. Leeward Islands (Report for 1904–1905). (November 30.)

No. 479. Bechuanaland Protectorate (Report for 1904–1905). (December 2.)

No. 480. Basutoland (Report for 1904–1905). (December 15.) 67

II. Miscellaneous.

No. 31. Northern Nigeria (Report on Cotton, Gum, and other Economic Products). (December 1.) 69

Trade Reports—I. Annual Series.

No. 3475. Portugal (Madeira).

No. 3476. Russia (Finland).

No. 3477. Turkey (Baghdad).

No. 3478. Portugal (Angola). (August 14.)

No. 3479. France (Algeria).

No. 3480. Russia (Odessa).

No. 3481. Russia (Riga). (August 18.)

No. 3482. France (Marseilles).

No. 3483. Turkey (The Hejaz). (August 19.)

No. 3484. Cuba.

No. 3485. Germany (Finances of the Kingdom of Prussia). (August 23.)

No. 3486. Austria-Hungary (Bohemia).

No. 3487. Italy (Leghorn).

No. 3488. Turkey (Tripoli). (August 25.)

No. 3489. United States (Boston).

No. 3490. Japan (Tainan). (August 26.)

No. 3491. Peru. (August 29.)

No. 3492. Tunis.

No. 3493. France (Society Islands). (August 31.)

No. 3494. Turkey (Crete).

No. 3495. Portugal (Chinde). (September 4.)

No. 3496. Italy (South Italy (Supplementary)).

Feb. 19.] *Page*

No. 3497. Turkey (Hodeida and Camaran).

No. 3498. France (Réunion). (September 9.)

No. 3499. Persia (Kharassan). (September 14.)

No. 3500. Persia (Sistan and Kain). (September 10.)]

No. 3501. Belgium. (September 21.)

No. 3502. Japan (Yokohama). September 22.)

No. 3503. Mexico (Vera Cruz).

No. 3504. Siam (Bangkok). September 23.)

No. 3505. China (Ningpo). September 27.)

No. 3506. Germany. (October 4.)

No. 3507. Persia (Azerbaijan.)

No. 3508. China (Wenchow). (October 10.)

No. 3509. France (Madagascar). (October 16.)

No. 3510. France. (October 17.)

No. 3511. Würtemberg. (October 19.)

No. 3512. United States (Philippine Islands). (October 27.)

No. 3513. France (The Ivory Coast). (November 3.)

No. 3514. Trans-Caucasus (Agriculture in 1905). (November 4.}

No. 3515. Uruguay.

No. 3516. Greece. (November 7.)

No. 3517. Zanzibar.

No. 3518. Portugal (Goa.) (November 14.)

No. 3519. Germany (German Colonies.) (December 5.)

No. 3520. Switzerland. (December 7.)

No. 3521. Brazil (Santos). (January 3.) 69

II. Miscellaneous Series.

No. 636. German Sea-fishing Industry and Trade. (August 19.)

No. 637. Japan (Tea Culture.)

No. 638. France (Chemical, Metal, and other Industries of Lyons). (September 4.)

No. 639. Argentine Republic (Quebracho and Cotton in the Argentine Chaco). (September 5.)

No. 640. Belgium (Scheme for the Extension of the Port of Antwerp). (September 27.)

No. 641. China (Land Taxation in the Province of Honan.) (November 17.)

No. 642. Germany (German Paper Industry and Export Trade). (November 25.) 7

Feb. 19.] *Page*

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

1. A light railway in the rural districts of Bath and of Keynsham in the county of Somerset (being an extension of the existing and authorised undertaking of Bath Electric Tramways, Limited).

2. Light railways in the county of Devon from Newton Ferrars to Yealmpton, and from Kingsbridge to Slapton, and to Salcombe.

3. Light railways in the county of Lincoln and the West Riding of the county of York. (August 16.)

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending—

1. The Holmfield and South Owram Light Railway Order, 1902. (August 16.)

2. The Central Essex Light Railway Order, 1901, and the Bardfield and Sible Hedingham Light Railway Order, 1901. (December 29.)

3. Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900. (December 29.)

III. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a light railway—

1. In the county of Somerset for Priston to Dunkerton.

2. In the county borough of Devonport. (December 29.)

IV. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending—

1. The Padstow, Bednethan, and Mawgan Light Railway Order, 1903.

2. The East Sussex Light Railway Order, 1901. (December 29.) .. 71

ARMY.

I. (Estimates)—Approximate Estimate of Expenditure under Military Works Acts of 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903. (August 29.)

II. (Regulations as to Pay).—List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Treasury pursuant to the Royal Warrant dated 27th October, 1884, during the year 1904–1905. (October 14.)

III. (Military Prisons).—Report on the discipline and management of the Military Prisons, 1904. (November 11.) 71

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).—Forty-third Report of the Inspector for the year 1904. (August 14.) 72

Feb. 19.] *Pag*

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1904–1905. (August 14.) 72

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1904–1905. (August 14.) 72

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND).—Thirty-seventh Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Records, for the year 1904. (August 15.) 72

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

I. Abstracts showing the acreage under crops and the number of live stock in each county and province, 1904–1905. (August 21.)

II. Agricultural statistics of Ireland with detailed Report for the year 1904. (September 5.) 72

EXPLOSIVES.

I. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Major A. Cooper Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of fireworks which occurred at the factory of Messrs. John Jennison and Company at Belle Vue, near Manchester, on the 9th July, 1905. (August 24.) ..

II. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Captain M. B. Lloyd, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitro-glycerine, which occurred in the fitters' shop of the factory of the "Explosives and Chemical Products, Limited," at Bramble Island, Essex, on the 11th July, 1905. (October 14.)

III. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending the destruction of a factory magazine at the factory of the Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, Limited, at St. Mary's Marshes, in the Hundred of Hoo, Kent, on the 29th July, 1905. (November 14.) 72

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

I. Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to inquire into and report upon the fruit industry of Great Britain; with appendices and index. (August 24.)

II. Annual Report on the distribution of grants for agricultural education and research in the year 1904–1905, with statements respecting the several colleges and institutions aided, and a summary of the agricultural instruction provided by county councils in 1904–1905, and the expenditure on the same in 1903–1904 and in 1904–1905. (January 3.) 7

WESTERN PACIFIC.—Report on the trade of the New Hebrides, by Captain Ernest Rason, R.N., Resident Deputy Commissioner. (August 19.) 7

eb. 19.] Page

INDIA.

I. (Army Administration).—Further papers regarding the administration of the army in India (in continuation of [Cd. 2615.]). (August 21.)

II. (Trade)—Review of the trade of India, 1904–1905. (October 11.)

III. (Re-constitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam)—Further papers relating to the re-constitution of the provinces of Bengal and Assam (in continuation of [Cd. 2656.]). (October 12).

IV. (Statistical Abstract).—Statistical abstract relating to British India from 1894–1895 to 1903–1904. Thirty-ninth Number. (October 18.)

V. (Sanitary Measures).—Report on sanitary measures in India in 1903 73

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871); together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade, upon certain accidents which were inquired into—

I. During the three months ended 31st March, 1905. (August 30.)

II. During the three months ended 30th June, 1905. (October 11.) .. 74

MPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).—Annual Report for the year 1904–1905. (September 2.) 74

RISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1905. (September 5.) 74

OLICE (METROPOLIS).—Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, for the year 1904. (September 7.) 74

VORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.—Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1904. (September 8.) 74

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

I. (Reports on Children under Five Years of Age). Reports on children under five years of age in public elementary schools by women inspectors of the Board of Education. (September 8.)

II. (Administrative County of Stafford. Endowed Charities (Elementary Education).) Report made to the Board of Education on the result of any inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the administrative county of Stafford, or in any part thereof. (September 16.)

Feb. 19.]

III. Regulations relating to the Royal College of Science, the Royal College of Art, and to Museums under the Board of Education, from 1st August, 1905, to 31st July, 1906. (October 10.)

IV. (Statistics of Public Education, 1903, 1904, 1905). Statistics of public education in England and Wales, 1903, 1904, 1905. (November 21.)

V. Report to the Board of Education for the year 1904–1905. (November 23.)

VI. Inter-departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools.

Vol. I. Report and Appendices. (November 13.)

Vol. II. List of Witnesses, Minutes of Evidence, Appendices and Index. (November 27.)

VII. Report from University Colleges, 1905. (November 30.)

VIII. (List of Evening Schools.) List of evening schools under the administration of the Board, for the school year, 1903–1904). (December 18.) .. ..

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

I. (Proceedings).—

1. Return of Proceedings during July, 1905. (September 16.)
2. Return of Proceedings during August, 1905. (September 20.)
3. Return of Proceedings during September, 1905. (November 8.)

II. (Estates Commissioners.) Report of Proceedings for the period from 1st November, 1903, to 31st March, 1905. (September 27.) .. ..

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).—Forty-eighth Report, for the year 1904, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools; Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI. (September 18.) .. ..

CANADA (IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN CATTLE INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Despatch from the Governor-General of Canada, with the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. (September 19.) .. ..

BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.—Report on the working of the Uganda railway and the steamboat service on Lake Victoria, 1904–1905. (September 21.) .. ..

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and inland fisheries of Ireland for the year 1904; Part I. General Report. (September 22.) .. ..

Feb. 19.]

Page

MINES AND QUARRIES.

I. (General Report and Statistics for 1904; Part II. Labour.) General report and statistics relating to persons employed and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, and to the enforcement of the Mines and Quarries Acts. (September 23.)

II. (General Report and Statistics for 1904; Part III. Output.) General report and statistics relating to the output and value of the minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of minerals. (October 3.)

III. (National Colliery Explosion.) Reports to His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department by E. Milner Jones, Barrister-at-Law, and by F. A. Gray and J. T. Robson, two of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending the explosion which occurred at the National Colliery, Wattstowon, on the 11th July, 1905. (November 11.) .. 76

JAPAN, No. 2 (1905).—Despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburgh, forwarding a copy of the Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905. (September 6.) 76

POOR LAW COMMISSIONERS' REPORT OF 1834. Report made in 1834 by the Commissioners for Inquiry into the administration and practical operation of the Poor Laws. (September 12.) 76

MUSCAT, No. 1 (1905).—Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to decide on the question of the grant of the French Flag to Muscat dhows. (September 28.) 76

FRANCE, No. 1 (1905).—Agreement between His Majesty's Government and the French Government for the constitution of an Arbitral Tribunal to settle the indemnity to be awarded to the French citizens lately engaged in the fishery on the treaty shore of Newfoundland, and statement of sums allotted by the arbitrators. (September 28.) 77

MISCELLANEOUS, No. 4 (1905).—Agreements between the Argentine Republic and the Republic of Chile. Signed on 28th May, 1902, 10th July, 1902, and 9th January, 1903. (October 13.) 77

AFRICA, No. 6 (1905).—Reports relating to the administration of the East Africa Protectorate. (October 28.) 77

TURKEY, No. 3 (1905).—Further correspondence respecting the affairs of South-Eastern Europe. (In continuation of Turkey, No. 2, 1905.) (November 28.) 77

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Correspondence relating to the future organization of Colonial Conferences. (December 1.) 77

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (LAUNDRIES).—List of religious and charitable institutions in which laundries are carried on. (Second Issue.) (September 26.) 77

Feb. 19.] *Page*

CYPRUS.—

I. Report by Professor Wyndham Dunstan, F.R.S., on the agricultural resources of Cyprus, with special reference to cotton cultivation and correspondence relating thereto. (September 28.)

II. Annual Report for 1904–1905. (*November* 17.) 77

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Statistics for June, 1905. (October 10.) 77

LONDON TRAFFIC (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire and report on the means of locomotion and traffic in London.

Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence.

Vol. III. Appendices. (October 14.)

Vol. V. and Vol. VI. Maps and Diagrams, with Index. (December 29.)

Vol. VII. and Vol. VIII. Report to the Royal Commission on London Traffic by the Advisory Board of Engineers, and Appendix. (October 2.) 77

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1869.—Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland, for the year 1904. (October 20.) 78

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1905. (October 21.) 78

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND).—Report of the Board for the year ended 31st March, 1905. (October 26.) 78

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1905. (October 30.) 78

IRISH TEACHERS' PENSION RULES.—Rules under Section 11 of the National School Teachers' (Ireland) Act, 1879. (November 1.) 78

SWITZERLAND (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF INTERIM STATEMENT).—Translation of the New "General" Customs Tariff of Switzerland, as modified by the New Commercial Treaties concluded with Germany and Italy. (November 8.) 78

BOND INVESTMENT COMPANIES COMMITTEE.

I. Report of the Departmental Committee on Bond Investment Companies.

II. Appendices to the Report. (November 8.) 78

LUNACY (IRELAND).—Fifty-fourth Report (with Appendices) of the Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland), for the year ended 31st December 1904. (November 9.) 78

Feb. 19.] *Page*

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).—Return in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of March, 1905, on Duty on the Railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time, or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest. (November 20.) 79

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Section I. Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1904.

Section II. Inspectors, training colleges, schools in operation, etc.

Section III. Examination papers set at the annual examinations, 1904; Summary of the answering. (November 10.) 79

WEST INDIES.—West Indian Inter-colonial Sanitary Convention, 1904, adopted by legislation in Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and the Leeward Islands. (November 13.) 79

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.—Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1904. (November 18.) 79

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).

I. Supplement to the Forty-eighth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1902). (November 30.)

II. Forty-ninth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1903.) (December 12.) 79

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.—Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works (in continuation of [Cd. 2279.]). (December 7.) 79

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Report for the year 1905, by J. Struthers, Esq., C.B., LL.D. (December 7.) 79

NAVY.

I. (Admiralty Policy).—A statement of Admiralty policy. (December 9.)

II. (Gunnery).—Result of test of gunlayers with heavy guns in His Majesty's fleet, 1905. (December 12.) 80

INEBRIATE RETREATS IRELAND).—First report, with appendices, of the Inspector for Ireland for the years 1903–1904. (December 18.) 80

FOREIGN IMPORT DUTIES, 1905.—Statement of the rates of import duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Japan, China, and Persia, upon produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom, (December 20.) 80

Feb. 19.]

COMMERCIAL.

No. 4. (1905).—Further reports from His Majesty's Representatives on navigable inland waterways in Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. (December 22.)

No. 5. (1905).—Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Bucharest, transmitting the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and Roumania, signed on 31st October, 1905. (December 30.)

No. 1. (1906).—Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Sofia, transmitting the commercial convention between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria, signed 9th December, 1905. (January 8.)

No. 2. (1906).—Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Havana, transmitting the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and Cuba, signed at Havana, 4th May, 1905. (January 8.) .. 8

NIGERIA.—Correspondence relating to railway construction in Nigeria. (December 29.) 8

ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1904 (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Report of His Majesty's Commissioners for the International Exhibition at St. Louis, 1904. (December 29.) 8

CHINA, No. 2, 1905.—Report by Mr. Walter J. Clennell, His Majesty's Consul at Kingkiang, on a journey in the interior of Kiangsi. (With a map). (December 30.) 8

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (ELECTORS, ETC.), (UNITED KINGDOM).—Return showing, with regard to each Parliamentary constituency in the United Kindgom, the total number, and as far as possible the number in each class of the electors on the register now in force, and also showing the population and inhabited houses in each constituency. (January 2.) .. 8

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT, 1903.—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Chester Jones, Esq., Barrister-at-law, on the bye-laws made by the London County Council under the Employment of Children Act, 1903. (January 5.) 8

TRANSVAAL.

I. Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal Mines in continuation of [Cd. 2401], April, 1905, and [Cd. 2563], July, 1905). (December 1.)

II. Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines (in continuation of [Cd. 2786], December, 1905). (January 8.) 8

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

I. Reports on the manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., preserved at Dropmore, Vol. V., and of the Earl of Verulam, preserved at Gorhambury. (January 8.)

II. Calendar of Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells. Vol. I. (January 8.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. ..

Feb. 19.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY.—(Estimates)—Estimates for the year 1906–1907, with explanation of differences.

Statement of First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1906–1907.

(Battle Practice)—Result of battle practice in His Majesty's Fleet, 1905 81

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Report for the year 1905, by the Director, on the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh 82

TRANSVAAL.—Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines 82

TREATY SERIES, No. 1 (1906).—Agreement additional to the Money Order Convention of 8th December, 1882, between the United Kingdom and France, signed at Paris, 20th April, 1904. (Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906) 82

COMMERCIAL, No. 3 (1906).—International Sugar Commission, Autumn Session, 1905 ; Report of proceedings (in continuation of Commercial, No. 3 (1905) 82

ROUMANIA (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF (INTERIM STATEMENT).—Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by Commercial Treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany 82

CANCER RESEARCH (COLONIES).—Further correspondence relating to the Cancer Research Scheme (in continuation of [Cd. 2342], February, 1905) 82

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the Three Months ended 30th September, 1905, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871), together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into 82

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.—Return of the numbers and nationalities of the passengers that left the United Kingdom for places out of Europe in each month of the year 1906, distinguishing the principal countries in which the passengers contracted to land 82

TRADE DISPUTES AND TRADE COMBINATIONS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of trade disputes and trade combinations, and as to the law affecting them 83

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

1. Return for the month of October, 1905.
2. Return for the month of November, 1905.
3. Return for the month of December, 1905 83

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 83

Feb. 19.] *Page*

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 83

METEOROLOGY.—Report of the Meteorological Council to the President and Council of the Royal Society, for the year ended 31st March, 1905 83

TRADE UNIONS (BOARD OF TRADE LABOUR DEPARTMENT).—Report by the chief labour correspondent of the Board of Trade on trade unions in 1902–1904, with comparative statistics for 1895–1904 83

WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED SEAMEN.—Account of the sums received and paid in respect of the wages and effects of deceased seamen in the year ended 31st March, 1905 83

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903 (REGULATIONS).—Regulations made by the Lord Lieutenant in pursuance of the provisions of Section 23 (8) of the Act 83

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Comparative statement of pauperism and cost of the relief of the poor in certain years from 1848–1849 to 1904–1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 83

LUNACY.

1. Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics between 1st April, 1905, and 30th September, 1905.

2. Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, and the number of patients seen, by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended 31st December, 1905. 84

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Draft Order in Council, continuing certain provisions in the Order in Council of 6th March, 1902 84

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

1. (Collisions at Sea)—Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, amending Article 10 of the regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of the 11th August, 1880, for preventing collisions at sea.

2. Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, approving certain new pilotage bye-laws made by the Pilotage Board of Port Talbot.

3. Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, revoking a proviso in paragraph 24 of the regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 24th March, 1902, relating to the registry of British sea-fishing boats. .. 84

COLONIAL PROBATES ACT, 1892.—Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, applying the Colonial Probates Act, 1892, to the Orange River Colony .. 84

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.—Order in Council, dated 20th November, 1905, approving a scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for transferring to the Newcastle Chapter Endowment Fund the endowment of a canonry in the Cathedral Church of Durham 84

Feb. 19.] *Page*

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACT, 1866.—Order in Council, dated 20th November, 1905, amending the Order in Council of 20th March, 1877, applying to day industrial schools the provisions of the Industrial Schools Acts, and revoking the previous amending Order of 11th July, 1905 84

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSION ACT, 1865.—Order in Council, dated 20th November, 1905, approving a memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to a rule by which retired pay and pension, except pensions for wounds of commissioned, commissioned warrant, and warrant officers, shall be held only during good behaviour, and may be forfeited or suspended for misconduct or restored at the discretion of the Admiralty 85

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1858 (INDIA OFFICE).—Order in Council, dated 11th December, 1905, approving a statement of new and revised appointments and alterations of salaries in the establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council 85

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890 (ORDERS IN COUNCIL).

1. Dated 11th December, 1905, entitled "the Brunei Order in Council, 1905";

2. Dated 8th January, 1906, entitled "the Somaliland Order in Councils, 1906";

3. Dated 8th January, 1906, making provision for a Seal for His Britannic Majesty's Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa 85

INDIA.

1. (Examinations) Revision of paragraph 8 of the regulations for the admission of candidates to the Civil Service of India;

2. (Loans raised in India.) Return of all loans raised in India chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 30th September, 1905, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year, the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half-year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year, stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year;

3. (Loans raised in England)—Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament, chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 30th September, 1905, with the rates of interest, and total amount payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year, the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half-year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year, stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year.

Feb. 19.] *Page*

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

I. Orders made by the councils of the following counties, boroughs, county boroughs, metropolitan boroughs, and urban districts, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing certain shops in the :—

1. County borough of Bury.
2. Borough of Barrow-in-Furness.
3. County borough of St. Helens.
4. Borough of Swindon.
5. Metropolitan borough of Deptford.
6. Metropolitan borough of Greenwich.
7. Borough of Leicester.
8. County borough of Stockport.
9. Borough of Ashton-under-Lyne.
10. County borough of Halifax.
11. County borough of Birkenhead.
12. Borough of Accrington.
13 County borough of Cardiff.
14. County borough of Middlesbrough.
15. Urban district of Shipley.
16. Urban district of Pontypridd.
17. Borough of Stafford.
18. Borough of Wolverhampton.
19. County of Lancaster, within the following urban district—
    1. Atherton (Hindsford).
    2. Levenshulme.
    3. Padiham.
    4. Tyldesley-with-Shakerley.
    5. Great Harwood.
    6. Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church (part of).
    7. Rishton.
    8. Church (part of).
20. County of Monmouth, within the urban districts of Blaenavon, Abersychan, Pontypool, Panteg, Llanvrechva Upper, and Llantarnam.
21. Metropolitan borough of Battersea.
22. Metropolitan borough of Southwark.

Feb. 19.] Page

23. Metropolitan borough of Camberwell.

4. Corporation of the borough of Barnsley.

25. Corporation of the borough of Newport.

6. Corporation of the borough of Darwen.

27. Council of the county borough of Grimsby.

28. Council of the borough of Swansea.

29. County borough of Salford.

30. County borough of Rochdale.

31. County borough of Oldham.

II. Closing Orders made by the urban district councils of—

1. Limavady.

2. Portadown.

3. Ballymena.

4. Banbridge.

5. Coleraine.

6. Ballymoney.

III. Orders by the Secretary for Scotland providing for the early closing of certain shops in—

1 and 2. The burgh of Motherwell.

3. The burgh of Clydebank.

4. The city of Glasgow.

5. The burgh of Kinning Park.

6. The burgh of Partick.

7. The burgh of Govan.

8. The burgh of Dundee.

9. The burgh of Paisley.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCES).

Licences granted by His Majesty to—1. John Bond, (2) George Lamb, (3) Marion Seddon, (4) William Grant, (5) Robert Allen, under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1803–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864.

2. Ada Brown, a convict under detention in Aylesbury prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Home of Compassion, Pimlico, S.W.

3. Sarah Craddock, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the London Female Preventive and Reformatory Institution, Holloway, N.

Feb. 19.] *Page*

4. Margaret Hartley, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the East End Refuge, Finchley, N. 85

POLLING DISTRICTS.

Orders made by the—

1. County council of the county of Southamption constituting the parish of Grayshott a separate polling district in the Petersfield parliamentary division.

2. County council of the county of Stafford constituting the parish of Quarry Bank a separate polling district in the Kingswinford division of the county for the purposes of parliamentary elections.

3. County council of the county of Surrey altering certain polling districts within the county (3 orders).

4. Justices of the Kensington Petty Sessional Division dividing the Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea into polling districts.

5. County council of the county of Southampton constituting the Blackmoor Ward of the parish of Selborne a separate polling district in the Petersfield parliamentary division of the county.

6. County council of the county of Dorset dividing the parish of Corfe Mullen into polling districts.

7. Council of the borough of Birkenhead altering one of the polling districts in the borough.

8. County council of the county of Southampton altering certain polling districts in the New Forest parliamentary division of the county.

9. County council of the county of Lancaster re-dividing the Ormskirk, Prestwich, and Stretford parliamentary divisions into convenient polling districts.

10. County council of the county of Essex altering certain polling districts in the Romford parliamentary division.

11. County council of the county of Huntingdon altering certain polling districts in the northern parliamentary division of the county.

12. County council of the council of Durham altering certain polling districts in the Bishop Auckland and mid-parliamentary divisions of the county 88

LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS ACT, 1896, MOTOR CAR ACT, 1903.—Orders by the Secretary for Scotland prohibiting motor car traffic on certain highways in the counties of—

1. Haddington (dated 31st October, 1905).

2. Forfar (dated 3rd January, 1906).

3. Argyll (district of Ardnamurchan) (dated 15th November, 1905).

4. Argyll (district of the island of Mull) (dated 31st October, 1905).

5. Bute (district of the island of Arran) (dated 31st October, 1905) .. 89

Feb. 19.] *Page*

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.—Regulations, dated 14th November, 1905, made by the Local Government Board for Scotland under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Section 4 (3), respecting organisation for unemployed 89

ALIENS ACT, 1905.—Act of Adjournal for regulating the procedure in Scotland under the Aliens Act, 1905 89

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).—Four Orders in Council, dated 4th November, 1905, for holding winter assizes in Ireland. 89

GENERAL PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.—Order closing female prison at Limerick 89

PHARMACY (IRELAND) ACTS, 1875 TO 1890, ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

1. Dated 4th November, 1905, approving of Regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society.

2. Dated 7th February, 1906, approving of an amended regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society 89

MILITIA ACT, 1882 (DEPUTY LIEUTENANTS).—Returns of descriptions of qualifications of Deputy Lieutenants lodged during 1905, as furnished to the Chief Secretary for Ireland 90

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

I. Orders with respect to the urban county districts of—

1. Bangor.

2. Monaghan.

3. Carrickmacross.

II. Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed), Ireland, 1905 90

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).—Regulations for the appointment of members of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction 90

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

I. Time table of examinations for the year 1906.

II. Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland—

1. Amending Rule 42 (iv) (I) (6), and Rule 45 of the rules for 1906.

2. Substituting a work in the middle-grade honours programme in Irish, 1906, for that originally prescribed.

3. Prescribing an alternative work in the middle-grade pass programme in French for 1906.

III. Rule made identifying the syllabuses of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the purposes of the rules of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1906.

IV. Rules and programme of examinations for 1906 90

Feb. 19.] Page

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACT, 1904. (REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS).—Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 1 of the Secretary for Scotland Act, 1904, as to the transfer to the Secretary for Scotland of certain powers and duties in connection with reformatories and industrial schools 90

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION (CAPITAL AND INCOME ACCOUNTS, 1904–1905).—Accounts of the receipt and expenditure of the capital and of the income derived from the lands and other property held for the benefit of Greenwich Hospital, and the Foundation of Samuel Travers, Esquire, for the year ended 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon 91

RAMSGATE HARBOUR.—Statement of the receipts and payments made by the Board of Trade, for the year ended 31st March, 1905; together with an account of the receipt and issue of stores 91

LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES.—Statement of accounts and of life assurance and annuity business and abstracts of actuarial reports deposited with the Board of Trade under Section 10 of "the Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870," during the year ended 31st December, 1905 91

GENERAL LIGHTHOUSE FUND.—An account of the General Lighthouse Fund, showing income and expenditure for year ended 31st March, 1905 91

WEST HIGHLAND RAILWAY (EXTENSION FROM BANAVIE TO MALLAIG).—Fourth Annual Report by the Board of Trade as to the condition and working of the Banavie to Mallaig Railway, the rates and charges for traffic, and the receipts and expenditure of any company in working the railway, for the year 1904–1905 91

COMMITTALS (IRELAND).—Returns from the Clerks of the Crown and Peace of the number of persons committed for trial in 1905 91

POST OFFICE (STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905).—

1. No. 1065. (Telegraphs)—The Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1905. Dated 1st September, 1905.

2. No. 1328. (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Costa Rica)—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 18) Warrant, 1905. Dated 21st December, 1905.

3. No. 951. (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Madeira)—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 16) Warrant, 1905. Dated 12th August, 1905.

4. No. 1366. (Inland Post)—The Inland Post Amendment (No.3) Warrant, 1905. Dated 28th December 1905.. 91

SAVINGS BANKS (INVESTMENT) REGULATIONS.—Draft Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations, 1906 92

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Treasury Minute, dated 14th February, 1906, authorising the lease of a plot of land at the Dalkey end of the disused tramway from Kingstown to Dalkey 92

eb. 19.] Page

UCHY OF CORNWALL.—Account of the receipts and disbursements of the Duchy of Cornwall in the year ended 31st December, 1905 92

UPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury Minutes granting under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887, retired allowances to—

Reginald P. Tibbs, deputy cashier in charge, Ryal Victoria Yard, Deptford (27th November, 1905); J. W. Metcalfe and W. F. Ridsdale, sorting clerks and telegraphists; R. L. Frost, 1st class clerk, Money Order Office; and W. B. Crane, overseer and junior telegraphist, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office (23rd November, 1905); Charles Bennett, 1st class assistant architect and surveyor, Office of Works (31st October, 1905).

II. Treasury Minutes declaring that the following persons were appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their departments—

Harry Mott, postmaster, Cowes (23rd October, 1905); William Fretton, Bridewell, keeper at New Ross, Bridewell, Irish Prison Service (8th January, 1906); Thomas Moodie, engineer in charge of pumping machinery, Dover, War Office (22nd January, 1906); William Chevalier, clerk, His Majesty's Consulate, Alexandria; Giovanni Fabri, assistant clerk, His Majesty's Consulate, Alexandria; Saverio Inglott, shipping clerk, His Majesty's Consulate, Alexandria; Shukvallah Fathalla Huri, dragoman, His Majesty's Consular Service, Alexandria, Consular Service (9th December, 1905) 92

ROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.—Treasury Minute declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Treasury Solicitor in Ireland professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required (12th January, 1906). 93

PERIAL OTTOMAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1855.—Account for the year to 31st December, 1905, prepared under the Act, showing the sums issued and applied for interest as guaranteed by Her late Majesty, and for management of the Imperial Ottoman Guaranteed Loan of 1855, and also of the repayment in respect of advances under the said Act 93

ANK OF ENGLAND.—Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 25th October, 1905, which have been written off .. 93

ISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS 1860 TO 1904.—Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a visiting Committee to the prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) 93

NIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.—Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Glasgow to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Act, for the year 1904–1905.

Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1904–1905.

Annual Report on the state of the finances of the University of Edinburgh under the provisions of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1904–1905 93

Feb. 19.] Pag

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

I. (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries.)

Regulations, dated 17th October, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 in respect of the process of spinning by self-acting mules.

Regulations, dated 12th December, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the processes of sorting, willeying, washing, combing, and carding wool, goats hair, and camel hair, and processes incidental thereto.

II Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 15th August, 1905, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 .. 9

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Proclamation, dated 6th February, 1906, revoking the several proclamations mentioned in the schedule thereto 9

PICKLE POINT PIER, COUNTY MAYO.—Rules and Regulations 9

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.—Order, dated 12th September, 1905, entitled the Hull (Channel Islands, Animals) Landing-place Revocation Order of 1905 9

Order, dated 11th October, 1905, entitled the Manchester (Old Trafford) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1905.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 9

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.—Statutes made by the Governing Body of Merton College, Oxford, on the 18th March, 1904, amending Statutes III. and IV. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 3).

2. Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on the 23rd November, 1904, amending Statute IV. and Schedule B. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 4.)

3. Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on the 11th March, 1905, to amend the Ordinance regulating the Radcliffe Travelling Fellowships. (No. 5.)

4. Statutes made by the Governing Body of New College, Oxford, on the 21st June, 1905, in lieu of Statutes IV. and XIV. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 6.)

5. Statutes made by the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford, on the 29th June, 1905, altering Statutes XI., XVI., and XVIII. of the Statutes of the House. (No. 7.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed 9

Feb. 19.] *Page*

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889. UNIVERSITY COURT ORDINANCES.

No. XI. (Edinburgh No. 4)—Institution of degrees in veterinary medicine and surgery, and relative regulations. (No. 8.)

No. XII. (Edinburgh No. 5)—Inclusion of geography among the subjects qualifying for graduation in arts. (No. 9.)

No. XIII. (General No. 1)—Ordinance of the University Courts of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh. (No. 10.)

General No. 1. (Regulations for Degrees in Arts)—Supplementary to Ordinance No. 11. (No. 11.)

General No. 6. Of the Universities Commissioners. (No. 12.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed 95

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.

Scheme for effecting the union of two contiguous benefices situate within the Metropolis, and within the diocese of London, namely, the benefice (being a vicarage) of St. Mary Charterhouse and the benefice (being a vicarage) of St. Thomas Charterhouse, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. (No. 13.)

Scheme for effecting the union of two contiguous benefices situate within the Metropolis and within the city and diocese of London, namely, the benefice (being a rectory) of Saint Michael Cornhill, and the benefice (being a rectory) of Saint Peter Le Poor, with the vicarage of Saint Benet Fink annexed, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. (No. 14.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed 96

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR COMPANY (1812).—
Report and statement of accounts for the year ended 5th April, 1905 .. 96

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD.

Accounts for the year ended 1st July, 1905.

Delivered (according to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 96

PRIVATE BILLS.—Moved, That Standing Order No. 92 be considered in order to its being suspended, and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills which expires this day, be extended till To-morrow.—(The Chairman of Committees); agreed to; and ordered accordingly 96

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow at a quareter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Message to attend His Majesty.

The House went; and, being returned—

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law ..

NEW WRIT FOR THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (WESTERN OR WESTBURY DIVISION).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Wiltshire (Western or Westbury Division), in the room of John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, who, since his election for the said County, hath accepted the Office of one of the Commissioners for executing the Office of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland."—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) .. ..

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. J. Chamberlain*).

The Attorney-General (*Sir J. Lawson Walton, Leeds, S.*) .. .. ..
Sir Edward Carson (*Dublin University*) .. ..
The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) .. .. ..

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. SPEAKER do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of the Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Wilts (Western or Westbury Division) in the room of John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, who, since his election for the said county, hath accepted the Office of one of the Commissioners for executing the Office of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

NEW WRITS.

New Writ for the City of London, in the room of the hon. Alban George Henry Gibbs (Manor of Northstead).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) ..

ELECTIONS.—Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their Election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if anything shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate; and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

Feb. 19.] *Page*

Mr. Joseph Devlin, returned as Member for West Belfast and North Kilkenny, stated that he elected to sit for West Belfast.

Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, returned as a Member for North Sligo and North Leitrim, stated that he elected to sit for North Sligo.

Resolved that no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being actually be elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament 103

PRIVILEGE.

Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 106

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That Lord Atkinson, a Peer of Parliament, has, by his action in voting at the recent Election in the St. Stephen's Green Division of the City of Dublin, been guilty of a breach of the Privileges of this House."—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Mr. SPEAKER stated that he had received a letter from Lord Atkinson, which he read to the House.

Motion, by leave withdrawn.

ELECTIONS.

Resolved, That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to serve for the Commons in Parliament, concern himself in the Election of Members except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament.

Mr. Dillon 105

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery, or other corrupt practices.

WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime or misdemeanour, and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Feb. 19.] *Pag*

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that during the Session of Parliament the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid 10

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.—Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same 10

PRIVILEGES.—Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed 10

OUTLAWRIES BILL.—"For the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time 10

JOURNAL.

Ordered, That the Journal of this House, from the end of the last Session to the end of the present Session, with an index thereto, be printed. 10

Ordered, That 500 Copies of the said Journal and Index be printed by the appointment and under the direction of Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., the Clerk of this House. 10

Ordered, That the said Journal and Index be printed by such person as shall be licensed by Mr. SPEAKER, and that no other person do presume to print the same 10

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by His Majesty's Command during the Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Explosions (Messrs. John Jennison and Company's Factory at Belle Vue, near Manchester).—Copy of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of the State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Fireworks which occurred at the Factory of Messrs. John Jennison and Co., at Belle Vue, near Manchester, on the 9th July, 1905.

2. Explosions (Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, St. Mary's Marshes).—Copy of Report by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending the Destruction of a Factory Magazine at the Factory of the Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, Limited, at St. Mary's Marshes, in the Hundred of Hoo, Kent, on the 29th July, 1905.

3. Explosions (National Colliery, Wattstown).—Copy of Reports by E. Milner-Jones, Barrister-at-law, and F. A. Gray and J. T. Robson, two of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which occurred at the National Colliery, Wattstown, on the 11th July, 1905.

4. Explosions (Bramble Island, Essex).—Copy of Report by Captain M. B. Lloyd, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Nitro-Glycerine which occurred in the fitters' shop of the Factory of the "Explosives and Chemical Products, Limited," at Bramble Island, Essex, on the 11th July, 1905.

5. Factory and Workshop (Laundries).—Copy of List of Religious and Charitable Institutions in which Laundries are carried on (Second Issue).

6. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission).—Copy of Reports on the Manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, esquire, preserved at Dropmore, Vol. V., and of the Earl of Verulam, preserved at Gorhambury.

7. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission).—Copy of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, Vol. I.

8. Mines and Quarries.—Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1904; Part II., Labour; General Report and Statistics relating to Persons employed and accidents at mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, and to the enforcement of the Mines and Quarries Acts.

9. Mines and Quarries.—Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1904; Part III., Output; General Report and Statistics relating to the Output and Value of the Minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of Minerals.

10. Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Great Britain).—Copy of Forty-eighth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1904. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI.

11. Police (Metropolis).—Copy of Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1904.

12. Workmen's Compensation.—Copy of Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1904.

13. Prisons (England and Wales).—Copy of Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1905.

14. Trade Disputes and Trade Combinations (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the subject of Trade Disputes and Trade Combinations, and as to the Law affecting them.

Feb. 19.] *Page*

15. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence, Vol. III. Appendices).

16. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vols. V. and VI. Maps and Diagrams, with Index.

17. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vols. VII. and VIII. Report by the Advisory Board of Engineers, with Appendix).

18. Employment of Children Act, 1903.—Copy of Report by Chester Jones, esquire, barrister at-law, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the Bye-laws made by the London County Council under the Employment of Children Act, 1903.

19. St. Louis International Exhibition, 1904 (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of His Majesty's Commissioners for the International Exhibition at St. Louis, 1904.

20. Parliamentary Constituencies (Electors, etc.) (United Kingdom).—Copy of Return showing, with regard to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the Total Number, and, as far as possible, the Number in each class, of the Electors on the Register now in force, and also showing the Population and Inhabited Houses in each Constituency.

21. Irish Land Commission (Proceedings).—Copy of Return of Proceedings of the Irish Land Commission during the months of July, August, September, and October, 1905.

22. Irish Land Commission (Estates Commissioners).—Copy of Report of the Estates Commissioners for the period from 1st November, 1903, to 31st March, 1905.

23. National Education (Ireland).—Copy of Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1904. Section II.

24. National Education (Ireland).—Copy of Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1904. Section III.

25. Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Report on the Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 30th June, 1905.

26. Agricultural Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Abstracts showing the Acreage under Crops and the number of Live Stock in each county and province of Ireland for the year 1904–5.

27. Agricultural Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Agricultural Statistics of Ireland, with detailed Report for the year 1904.

28. Evictions (Ireland).—Copy of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1905.

Feb. 19.] *Page*

29. Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices).—Copy of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1905.

30. Lunacy (Ireland).—Copy of Fifty-fourth Report, with Appendices, of Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland) for the year 1904.

31. Congested Districts Board (Ireland).—Copy of Fourteenth Report of the Congested Districts Board (Ireland), being for the year ending 31st March, 1905.

32. Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Ireland).—Copy of Forty-third Report of the Inspector for the year 1904.

33. Fisheries (Ireland).—Copy of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1904. Part I. General Report.

34. Inebriate Retreats (Ireland).—Copy of First Report, with Appendices, of the Inspector of Inebriate Retreats in Ireland for the years 1903 and 1904.

35. Public Records (Ireland).—Copy of the Thirty-seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland, 1904.

36. Queen's College (Galway).—Copy of Report of the President of Queen's College (Galway) for the Session 1904–5.

37. Queen's College (Belfast).—Copy of Report of the President of Queen's College, Belfast, for the year 1904–5.

38. National School Teachers (Ireland) Pension (Rules).—Copy of Rules (1905), under Section 11 of the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879.

39. East India (Trade).—Copy of Review of Trade of India for 1904–5.

40. East India (Statistical Abstract).—Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1894–5 to 1903–4. Thirty-ninth Number.

41. East India (Sanitary Measures).—Copy of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1903–4 (Vol. XXXVII.).

42. Imperial Institute (Indian Section).—Copy of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1904–5.

43. East India (Army Administration).—Copy of Further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India.

44. East India (Reconstitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam).—Copy of Further Papers relating to the Reconstitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam.

45. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Distribution of Grants).—Copy of Annual Report on the Distribution of Grants for Agricultural Education and Research in the year 1904–5, &c.

g 2

Feb. 19.] *Page*

46. Fruit Culture (Departmental Committee).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to inquire into and report upon the Fruit Industry of Great Britain, with Appendices and Index.

47. Military Prisons.—Copy of Report on the Discipline and Management of Military Prisons in 1904.

48. Army.—Copy of Approximate Estimate of Expenditure (1905–6) under the Military Works Act of 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903.

49. Navy (Gunnery).—Copy of Statement showing Result of Test of Gunlayers with Heavy Guns in His Majesty's Fleet, 1905.

50. Navy.—Copy of a Statement of Admiralty Policy.

51. Board of Education.—Copy of Regulations relating to the Royal College of Science, the Royal College of Art, and to Museums under the Board of Education from 1st August, 1905, to 31st July, 1906.

52. Board of Education.—Copy of Reports from University Colleges, 1905.

53. Board of Education.—Copy of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904–5.

54. Board of Education.—Copy of Reports on Children under Five Years of Age in Public Elementary Schools by Women Inspectors of the Board of Education.

55. Board of Education.—Copy of Report on Charitable Endowments appropriated to purposes of Elementary Education in the Administrative County of Stafford.

56. Board of Education.—Copy of Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales, 1903–5.

57. Board of Education.—Copy of List of Evening Schools under the administration of the Board of Education for the school year 1903–4.

58. Medical Inspection and Feeding of School Children (Inter-Departmental Committee).—Copy of Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools. Vol. I. Report and Appendices.

59. Medical Inspection and Feeding of School Children (Inter-Departmental Committee).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools. Vol. II. List of Witnesses, Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index.

60. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900 (Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

61. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the County Borough of Devonport (Devonport Light Railway Order, 1905).

62. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The East Sussex Light Railway Order, 1901 (East Sussex Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

63. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Central Essex Light Railway Order, 1901, and The Bardfield and Sible Hedingham Light Railway Order, 1901 (Central Essex Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

64. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Somerset from Priston to Dunkerton (Priston Light Railway Order, 1905).

65. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Padstow, Bedruthan, and Mawgan Light Railway Order, 1903 (Padstow, Bedruthan, and Mawgan Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1905).

66. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the rural districts of Bath and of Keynsham in the county of Somerset, being an extension of the existing and authorised undertaking of Bath Electric Tramways, Limited (Bath Electric Tramways (Light Railway Extensions) Order, 1905).

67. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Holmfield and Southowram Light Railway Order, 1902 (Holmfield and Southowram Light Railway (Amendment and Extension of Time) Order, 1905).

68. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Lincoln and the West Riding of the county of York (Axholme Joint Railway (Hatfield Moor Extension Light Railway) Order, 1905).

69. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Devon from Newton Ferrers to Yealmpton, and from Kingsbridge to Slapton and to Salcombe (Devon South Hams Light Railways Order, 1905).

70. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ending 31st March, 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

Feb. 19.] Pag

71. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ending 30th June, 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

72. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 30th September, 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

73. Foreign Import Duties.—Copy of Statement of the Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Japan, China, and Persia, upon the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom in 1905.

74. Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Copy of Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of March, 1905, on duty on the railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours rest.

75. Switzerland.—New Customs Tariff (Interim Statement).—Copy of Translation of the New "General" Customs Tariff of Switzerland, as modified by the New Commercial Treaties concluded with Germany and Italy.

76. Bond Investment Companies (Departmental Committee).—Copy of Report of the Departmental Committee on Bond Investment Companies.

77. Judicial Statistics (Scotland).—Copy of Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland for the year 1904.

78. Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland).—Copy of Supplement to the Forty-eighth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland.

79. Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland).—Copy of Forty-ninth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1903).

80. Secondary Education (Scotland).—Copy of Report for the year 1905 by J. Struthers, Esq., C.B., LL.D., on Secondary Education in Scotland.

81. Peterhead Harbour.—Copy of Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works.

82. Poor Law Commission, 1834.—Copy of the Report made in 1834 by the Poor Law Commissioners.

83. Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copies of Reports, Nos. 454 (Turks and Caicos Islands, Annual Report for 1904), 455 (British Honduras, Annual Report for 1904), 456 (Seychelles, Annual Report for 1904), 457 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1904), 458 (Straits Settlements, Annual Report for 1904), 459 (Southern Nigeria, Annual Report for

Feb. 19.] *Page*

1904), 460 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1904), 461 (British Solomon Islands, Reports for 1903–4 and 1904–5), 462 (Malta, Report for 1904–5), 463 (Grenada, Annual Report for 1904), 464 (St. Vincent, Annual Report for 1904), 465 (Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1904), 466 (Barbados, Report for 1904–5), 467 (Uganda, Report for 1904–5), 468 (Somaliland, Report for 1904–5), 469 (Trinidad and Tobago, Report for 1904–5), 470 (Lagos, Annual Report for 1904), 471 (Bahamas, Report for 1904–5), 472 (British Central Africa Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 473 (Mauritius, Annual Report for 1904), 474 (Fiji, Annual Report for 1904), 475 (British East Africa Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 476 (Northern Nigeria, Annual Report for 1904), 477 (British Guiana, Report for 1904–5), 478 (Leeward Islands, Report for 1904–5), 479 (Bechuanaland Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 480 (Basutoland, Report for 1904–5).

84. Colonial Reports (Miscellaneous).—Copy of Report No. 31 (Northern Nigeria, Report on Cotton, Gum, and other Economic Products (No. II. of Series) by Professor W. Dunstan, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.).

85. Cancer Research (Colonies).—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to the Cancer Research Scheme.

86. Cyprus.—Copy of Annual Report on Cyprus for 1904–5.

87. Cyprus.—Copy of Report by Professor W. Dunstan, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., on the Agricultural Resources of Cyprus, with special reference to Cotton Cultivation, and Correspondence relating thereto.

88. Colonial Conference.—Copy of Correspondence relating to the Future Organisation of Colonial Conferences.

89. Transvaal.—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

90. Transvaal.—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

91. West Indies.—Copy of the West Indian Inter-Colonial Sanitary Convention, 1904, adopted by Legislation in Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and the Leeward Islands.

92. Straits Settlements.—Copy of Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1904.

93. Nigeria.—Copy of Correspondence relating to Railway Construction in Nigeria.

94. British East Africa Protectorate.—Copy of Report on the Working of the Uganda Railway and the Steamboat Service on Lake Victoria, 1904–5.

95. Canada.—Copy of Despatch from the Governor-General of Canada with the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies regarding the importation of Canadian Cattle into the United Kingdom.

96. Western Pacific.—Copy of Report on the Trade of the New Hebrides, by Captain Ernest Rason, R.N., Resident Deputy Commissioner.

Feb. 19.]

Pag

97. Treaty Series (No. 20, 1905).—Copy of Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting extra-territorial jurisdiction in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 25th February, 1905. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 12th June, 1905.

98. Treaty Series (No. 21, 1905).—Copy of Accession of Mexico to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 13th March, 1905.

99. Treaty Series (No. 22, 1905).—Copy of Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the junction of the Chinese and Burmese Telegraph Lines, being a revision of the Convention of 6th September, 1894. Signed in English and Chinese texts at Pekin, 23rd May, 1905.

100. Treaty Series (No. 23, 1905).—Copy of Declarations between the United Kingdom and Greece, with respect to Commercial matters. Signed at Athens 10th (23rd) November, 1904, and 4th (17th) May, 1905.

101. Treaty Series (No. 24, 1905).—Copy of International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic. Signed at Paris, 18th May, 1904. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 18th January, 1905.

102. Treaty Series (No. 25, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 2nd August, 1905.

103. Treaty Series (No. 26, 1905).—Copy of Parcel Post Agreement between the United Kingdom and Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, 28th July, 1905.

104. Treaty Series (No. 27, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between the United Kingdom and France relative to the Arbitral Tribunal contemplated by Article III. of the Convention of 8th April, 1904, respecting Newfoundland. Signed at London, 7th April, 1905.

105. Africa (No. 6, 1905).—Copy of Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate.

106. Japan (No. 2, 1905).—Copy of Despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg forwarding a Copy of the Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905.

107. Turkey (No. 3, 1905).—Copy of further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of South Eastern Europe.

108. China (No. 2, 1905).—Copy of Report by Mr. Walter J. Clennell, His Majesty's Consul at Kiukiang, on a Journey in the Interior of Kiangsi, with a Map.

109. France (No. 1, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between His Majesty's Government and the French Government for the constitution of an Arbitral Tribunal to settle the Indemnity to be awarded to the French citizens lately engaged in the Fishery on the Treaty Shore of Newfoundland, and Statement of sums allotted by the Arbitrators.

110. Muscat (No. 1, 1905).—Copy of the Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to decide on the question of the Grant of the French Flag to Muscat Dhows.

Feb. 19] *Page*

111. Navigable Inland Waterways (Commercial, No. 4, 1905).—Copies of Further Reports from His Majesty's Representatives on Navigable Inland Waterways in Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands.

112. Commercial Treaty with Roumania (Commercial, No. 5, 1905).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Bucharest transmitting the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Roumania, signed on the 31st October, 1905.

113. Commercial Convention with Bulgaria (Commercial, No. 1, 1906).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Sofia, transmitting the Commercial Convention between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria, signed on the 9th December, 1905.

114. Commercial Treaty with Cuba (Commercial, No. 2, 1906).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Havana, transmitting the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Cuba, signed at Havana on the 4th May, 1905.

115. Argentina and Chile (Miscellaneous, No. 4, 1905).—Copies of Agreements between the Argentine Republic and the Republic of Chile, signed on the 28th May, 1902, 10th July, 1902, and 9th January, 1903 [Address 8th August, 1905.—*Mr. Cremer*].

116. Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3475 to 3521.

117. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 636 to 642.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Supplementary Estimates, 1905–1906.—Estimate presented, of the Further Sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 1.] 120

Meteorology.—Copy presented, of Report of the Meteorological Council to the Royal Society for the year ending 31st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 120

Duchy of Cornwall.—Account presented of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Duchy of Cornwall for the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 2.] 120

mperial Ottoman Guaranteed Loan of 1855.—Copy presented, of Account for the year 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 120

Bank of England.—Copy presented, of Return of the amount of Notes issued more than 40 years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off on the 8th November, 1905, from the total amount of Notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 120

Feb. 19.] Pa

(Army Prize Money and Legacy Funds).—Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital (for Services other than those voted by Parliament) in the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Post Office Telegraphs, Including Telephones.—Account presented, showing ing the gross amount received and expended on account of the Telegraph Service during the year ended 31st March, 1905, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 3.] 12

Public Offices Site (Dublin) Act, 1903.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Public Offices Site (Dublin) Act, 1903, and of the Expenditure; the Money expended and borrowed and the Securities created under the said Act for the period ended the 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Public Offices (Acquisition of Site) Act, 1895, Session 2; Public Offices (Westminster) Site, 1896; Public Offices (Whitehall) Site Act, 1897; Public Buildings Expenses Act, 1898; And Public Buildings Expenses Act, 1903.—Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to the 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 4.] 12

Land Registry (New Buildings) Act, 1900.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund, under the provisions of The Land Registry (New Buildings) Act, 1900, and of the Expenditure; the Money expended and borrowed and the securities created under the said Act, for the period ended the 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 5] 12

Naval Works Acts, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903.—Account presented showing the amount of Money issued out of the Consolidated Fund; the mode in which it was provided; the amount and nature of the securities created in respect thereof; the amount of the surplus of Income above Expenditure for the financial year ended 31st March, 1896; and the amount of money expended in pursuance of the Acts during the year ended the 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 6] 1

Navy (Appropriation Account).—Copy presented, of the Appropriation Account of the Navy for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, and upon the Store Accounts of the Navy [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 7] 1

Army (Appropriation Account.)—Copy presented, of the Appropriation Account for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, and upon the Store Accounts of the Army [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 8] 1

Feb. 19.]

Page

Army (Ordnance Factories) (Appropriation Account).—Appropriation Account presented, of the sums granted by Parliament for the expense of the Ordnance Factories, the cost of the productions of which have been charged to the Army, Navy, and Indian and Colonial Governments, etc., and the Statement of the Surpluses and Deficits upon the Grants for the year ended 31st March, 1905, togther with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 9] 122

Civil Services and Revenue Departments (Appropriations Accounts).—Appropriation Accounts presented, for the year ending 31st March, 1905, together with the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon and certain Reports upon Store Accounts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 10] 123

Treasury Chest.—Account presented, for the year 1904–5, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 11] 123

Military Works Acts, 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903.—Account presented, for the period ended 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 12] 123

Public Works (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th February, 1906, authorising the lease of a plot of land at the Dalkey end of the disused Tramway from Kingstown to Dalkey [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 123

avings Banks (Investment) Regulations.—Copy presented, of Draft Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 123

uperannuation Act, 1884.—Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes declaring that the undermentioned persons were appointed to the offices set against their names without a Civil Service Certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their Departments, viz.:—William Chevalier Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Giovanni Favri, Assistant Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Saverio Inglott, Shipping Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Shukrallah Fathallah Huri, Dragoman, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Harry Mott, Postmaster, Cowes; William Fretton, Bridewell Keeper, at New Ross Bridewell, Irish Prisons Service; William Henry Edey, Admiralty Writer; Thomas Moodie, Engineer in Charge of Pumping Machinery, Dover, War Office; [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 123

uperannuation Act, 1887.—Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes granting a retired allowance to each of the following, viz.:—Charles Bennet, 1st Class Assistant Architect and Surveyor, Office of Works; Reginald P. Tibbs, Deputy Cashier in Charge, Royal Victoria Yard, Deptford; J. W. Metcalfe, Sorting Clerk and Telegraphist; W. F. Ridsdale, Sorting Clerk and Telegraphist; R. L. Frost, 1st Class Clerk, Money Orders Office; W. B. Crane, Overseer and Senior Telegraphist, Central Telegraph Office; [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 124

uperannuations.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 12th January, 1906, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Treasury Solicitor in Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required; [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 124

Feb. 19.]

Irish Land Commission (Proceedings).—Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the months of November and December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Evictions (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Irish Land Act, 1903 (Regulations).—Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant in pursuance of the provisions of Section 23 (8) of The Irish Land Act, 1903 [by Command] to lie upon the Table .. ..

Committals (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Returns from the Clerks of the Crown and Peace of the number of persons committed for trial in 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Closing Orders).—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Urban District Councils of Ballymoney, Coleraine, Limavady, Portadown, Ballymena, and Banbridge, and confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, closing certain Shops within the said Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Local Government Board (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor, Monaghan, and Carrickmacross [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ..

Local Government Board (Ireland).—Copy presented, of the Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed) Ireland, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table

Militia Act, 1882 (Deputy Lieutenants, Ireland).—Copy presented, of Return of descriptions of qualifications of Deputy Lieutenants lodged during 1905, as furnished to the Chief Secretary for Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Winter Assizes (Ireland).—Copies presented, of Four Orders in Council, dated 4th November, 1905, for holding Winter Assizes in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Intermediate Education (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Pharmacy Acts (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 4th November, 1905, approving Regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Pharmacy Acts (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 7th February, 1906, approving of an amended Regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. ..

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899.—Copy presented, of Regulations for the appointment of Members of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Page

risons (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Order closing the Female Prison at Limerick under the General Prisons (Ireland) Act, 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ntermediate Education (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Time Table of Examinations for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ntermediate Education (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland identifying the Syllabuses of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the purposes of the Rules of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ntermediate Education (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland prescribing an alternative work in the Middle Grade Pass Programme in French for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ntermediate Education (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland substituting a work in the Middle Grade Honours Programme in Irish, 1906, for that originally prescribed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ntermediate (Education) Ireland.—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland amending Rule 42 (iv.) I. (6) and Rule 45 of the Rules of 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 126

ailways (Ireland) Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Rules and Regulations under The Railways (Ireland) Act, 1896, for Pickle Point Pier [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 127

riminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Proclamation).—Copy presented, of a Proclamation, dated 6th February, 1906, revoking the several Proclamations mentioned in the Schedule thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 127

hop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Councils of the Boroughs of Accrington, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bury, Battersea, Deptford, Greenwich, Halifax, Middlesbrough, Swindon, Wolverhampton, Cardiff, Pontypridd, Stockport, St. Helens, Shipley, Southwark, Swansea, Camberwell, Barnsley, Newport (Mon.), Darwen, Grimsby, Stafford, Birkenhead, Leicester, and Barrow-in-Furness, and of the Counties of Lancaster and Monmouth, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 127

hop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Rochdale, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Barbers' and Butchers' Shops within the Borough, by the Council of the Borough of Oldham, fixing the hours of closing for shops in which the trade or business of a Barber, Hairdresser, Boot and Shoe Dealer, or Tailor is carried on, and by the Council of the Borough of Salford fixing the hours of closing for all shops at which the trade or business of a Boot Retailer is carried on [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 127

Feb. 19.] *Pa*

Polling Districts (Borough of Birkenhead).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Birkenhead, altering one of the Polling Districts in the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Essex).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Essex, altering certain Polling Districts in the Romford Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 12

Polling Districts (County of Southampton).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Southampton constituting the Parish of Grayshott a separate Polling District in the Petersfield Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Southampton).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Southampton altering certain Polling Districts in the New Forest Parliamentary Division of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Lancaster).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Lancaster redividing the Ormskirk, Prestwich, and Stretford Parliamentary Divisions into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Stafford).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Stafford constituting the Parish of Quarry Bank a separate Polling District of the Kingswinford Division of the County for the purposes of Parliamentary Elections [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Huntingdon).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Huntingdon altering certain Polling districts in the northern Parliamentary Division of the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea).—Copy presented, of Order made by the justices of the Kensington Petty Sessional Division, dividing the Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea into Poling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Durham altering certain Polling Districts in the Bishop Auckland and Mid Parliamentary Divisions of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Southampton).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Southampton constituting the Blackmoor Ward of the Parish of Selborne a separate Polling District in the Petersfield Parliamentary Division of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 12

Polling Districts (County of Dorset).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Dorset dividing the Parish of Corfe Mullen into Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

Polling Districts (County of Surrey).—Copies presented, of three Orders made by the County Council of the County of Surrey altering certain Polling Districts within the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 12

eb. 19.]

Page

enal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of Licence granted to Margaret Hartley, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the East End Refuge, Finchley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 129

enal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of a Licence to be at large granted to Sarah Craddock, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the London Female Preventive and Reformatory Institution, Holloway, N. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 129

enal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of a Licence to be at large granted to Ada Brown, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Home of Compassion, Pimlico, S.W. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 129

enal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licences).—Copies presented, of Licences to be at large granted to Marion Seddon, William Grant, George Lamb, and John Bowd, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A. of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

actory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries.)—Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 12th December, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the process of sorting, willeying, washing, combing, and carding wool, goats' hair and camel hair, and processes incidental thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

actory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries).—Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 17th October, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 59 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, in respect of the process of spinning by self-acting mules [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

actory and Workshop Acts (Home-Work).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 15th August, 1905, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

ecretary for Scotland Act, 1904 (Reformatory and Industrial Schools).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 1 of The Secretary for Scotland Act, 1904, as to the transfer to the Secretary for Scotland of certain powers and duties in connection with Reformatories and Industrial Schools [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 130

ransvaal.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 131

urks and Caicos Islands.—Copy presented, of Rules and Regulations for the Administration of the Central Prison, Grand Turk (by Act]; to lie upon the Table 131

t. Vincent.—Copy presented, of Rules for the Government of the Prison in St. Vincent [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 131

Feb. 19.] Pag

Pauperism (England and Wales).—Copy presented, of Comparative Statement of Pauperism and Cost of the Relief of the Poor in certain years from 1848–9 to 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1

East India (Examinations).—Copy presented, of Revision of paragraph 8 of the Regulations for the admission of Candidates to the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1

East India (Loans Raised in India). East India (Loans Raised in England).—Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1905, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 13.] 1

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 14.] 1

Local Authorities (Education).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th August, 1904; *Sir William Anson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 15.] 1

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council continuing certain provisions in the Order in Council of 6th March, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy presented of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Merton College, Oxford, on 18th March, 1904, amending the Statutes III. and IV. of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 16.] 1

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 11th March, 1905, amending the Ordinance regulating the Radcliffe Travelling Fellowships [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 17.] 1

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 23rd November, 1904, amending Statute IV. and Schedule B of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 18.] 1

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford, on 29th June, 1905, altering Statutes XI., XVI., and XVIII. of the Statutes of the House [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 19.] 1

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of New College, Oxford, on 21st June, 1905, in lieu of Statutes IV. and XIV. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 20.] 1

Feb. 19.] Page

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, amending Article 10 of the Regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 11th August, 1884, for preventing Collisions at Sea [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 132

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, approving certain new pilotage By-laws made by the Pilotage Board of Port Talbot [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1984.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, revoking a proviso in paragraph 24 of the Regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 24th March, 1902, relating to the Registry of British Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 133

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th December, 1905, entitled The Brunei Order in Council, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented of Order in Council of the 8th January, 1906, entitled the Somaliland Order in Council, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 8th January, 1906, making provision for a Seal for His Britannic Majesty's Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 133

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1858.—Copy presented of Order in Council of 11th December, 1905, approving a statement of new and revised appointments and alterations of salaries in the establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACT, 1866.—Copy presented of Order in Council of 20th November, 1905, amending the Order in Council of 20th March, 1877, relating to Day Industrial Schools and revoking the previous amending Order of 11th July, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

COLONIAL PROBATES ACT, 1892.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, applying The Colonial Probates Act, 1892, to the Orange River Colony [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 133

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 20th November, 1905, approving a Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for transferring to the Newcastle Chapter Endowment Fund the Endowment of a Canonry in the Cathedral Church of Durham [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 134

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 20th November, 1905, approving a Memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to a rule by which Retired Pay and Pensions, except Pensions for Wounds, of Commissioned, Commissioned Warrant, and Warrant Officers, shall be held only during good behaviour, and may be forfeited or suspended for misconduct, or restored at the discretion of the Admiralty [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. .. 134

Feb. 19.] *Page*

Education (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Report for the year 1905 by the Director on the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 134

Prisons (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 21.] 134

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Secretary for Scotland providing for the Early Closing of certain Shops in the Burghs of Paisley, Motherwell, Dundee, Clydebank, Govan, Glasgow, Kinning Park, and Partick [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 134

University of Edinburgh.—Copy presented, of Report on the state of the Finances of the University made by the University Court, for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 22.] .. 134

University of Edinburgh.—Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 23.] 135

University of Glasgow.—Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Glasgow for 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 24.] 135

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance No. XI. (Edinburgh, No. 4) (Institution of Degrees in Veterinary Medicine and Surgery and relative Regulations [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 25.] 135

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance No. XII. (Edinburgh, No. 5) (Inclusion of Geography among the subjects qualifying for Graduation in Arts) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 26.] 135

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—Copy presented, of Ordinance of the University Courts of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh (General, No. 1) (Regulations for Degrees in Arts, Supplementary to Ordinance No. 11 (General, No. 6) of the Universities Commissioners) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 27.] 13

Locomotives on Highways Act, 1896, and Motor Car Act, 1903.—Copies presented of Orders by the Secretary for Scotland prohibiting Motor Car Traffic on certain highways in the counties of Haddington, Forfar, Argyll (Districts of Ardnamurchan and the Island of Mull), and Bute (District of the Island of Arran) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 13

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.—Copy presented, of Regulation, dated 14th November, 1905, made by the Local Government Board for Scotland under The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Section 4 (3), respecting Organisation for Unemployed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 13

Aliens Act, 1905.—Copy presented, of Act of Abjournal for regulating the Procedure in Scotland under The Aliens Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 13

Feb. 19.] *Page*

Penal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Copy presented, of a Licence granted to Robert Allen, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1867 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 136

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Post).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 18) Warrant, 1905, dated 21st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 136

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Post).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 16) Warrant, 1905, dated 12th August, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 136

Post Office (Inland Post).—Copy presented, of the Inland Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1905, dated 28th December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 136

Post Office (Telegraphs).—Copy presented, of the Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1905, dated 1st September, 1905, [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 136

Navy Estimates, 1906–1907.—Estimates presented, for the year 1906–7, with Explanation of Differences [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 28.] 136

Navy (Statement Explanatory of Estimates).—Copy presented, of Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 136

Navy (Pay, Non-Effective Pay, and Allowances).—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Navy Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 137

Navy (Battle Practice).—Copy presented, of Result of Battle Practice in His Majesty's Fleet, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 137

Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation.—Accounts presented, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 29.] 137

Treaty Series (No. 1, 1906).—Copy presented, of Agreement additional to the Money Order Convention of 8th December, 1882, between the United Kingdom and France. Signed at Paris, 20th April, 1904. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 137

Sugar Convention (Commercial, No. 3, 1906).—Copy presented, of Report of British Delegate at the International Sugar Commission, Autumn Session, 1905, and Correspondence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 137

Wages and Effects of Deceased Seamen.—Account presented, of the Sums received and paid in respect of the Wages and Effects of Deceased Seamen in the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 137

Feb. 19.] Page

TRADE UNIONS.—Copy presented, of Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions in 1902–4, with Comparative Statistics for 1895–1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 137

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.—Copy presented, of Return of the Numbers and Nationalities of the Passengers that left the United Kingdom for Places out of Europe in each month of the year 1906, distinguishing the principal Countries in which the Passengers contracted to land [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 138

LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES.—Copy presented, of Statements of Accounts, and of Life Assurance and Annuity Business and Abstracts of Actuarial Reports, deposited with the Board of Trade during the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 30.] 138

RAMSGATE HARBOUR.—Copy presented, of Statement of the Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st March, 1905, together with an Account of the Receipt and Issue of Stores [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 31.] 138

GENERAL LIGHTHOUSE FUND.—Account presented, of the General Lighthouse Fund showing the income and expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 32.] 138

WEST HIGHLAND RAILWAY (EXTENSION FROM BANAVIE TO MALLAIG).—Copy presented, of Fourth Annual Report by the Board of Trade as to the condition and working of the Banavie and Mallaig Railway, the rates and charges for traffic, and the receipts and expenditure of any Company in working the Railway, for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 33.] 138

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 138

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS (1894 TO 1903).—Copies presented, of Orders entitled; (1) The Hull (Channel Islands Animals) Landing Place Revocation Order of 1905, and (2) The Manchester (Old Trafford) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 139

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

1. Union of Benefices Act (Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink).—Copy of Scheme under the Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink [by Act].

2. Union of Benefices Act (St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse).—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an union of the Benefices of St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse [by Act].

3. Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 34.]

Feb. 19.] Page

4. Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.—Copy of Accounts of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board for the year ending 1st July, 1905 [by Act].

5. Lunacy.—Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of Patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics between 1st April, 1905, and 30th September, 1905. [by Act].

6. Lunacy.—Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of Patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on the 31st December, 1905. [by Act].

7. Lunacy.—Copy of Return of all sums received by the Visitors of Lunatics for travelling expenses, or upon any other account, from 1st January to 31st December, 1905. [by Act] 139

Notices of Government Bills 139

King's Speech.—Mr. Speaker reported His Majesty's Speech, and read it to the House.

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).

Mr. W. H. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 140
Mr. Acland (Yorkshire, Richmond) 145

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.) 149
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 164

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,

Feb. 19.] *Page*

beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament." (*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 176
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 180
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 193
Mr. Paul (*Northampton*) 201

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Burdett-Coutts*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.—Annual accounts for the year ending 5th January, 1905, of Exchequer bills and other Government securities purchased.

Applications made by the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England for advances to Government authorised by Parliament from 5th January, 1905, to 5th January, 1906 205

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Orders made by the Councils of the following county, borough, and urban district, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing certain shops in the—

City and County of Kingston-upon-Hull.

Borough of Eccles.

County of Chester.

Urban district of Swinton and Pendlebury 205

DUCHY OF LANCASTER.—Account of the receipts and disbursements of the Duchy of Lancaster in the year ended 21st December, 1905; also a separate account of the capital of the said Duchy to the same date.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 205

House adjourned at half-past Four o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath.

NEW WRITS.—New Writ for the County of Kilkenny (North Kilkenny Division), in the room of Joseph Devlin, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Kilkenny (North Kilkenny Division) and also for the Borough of Belfast (West Belfast Division), has elected to sit for the Borough of Belfast (West Belfast Division).—(*Captain Donelan.*)

New Writ for the County of Leitrim (North Leitrim Division), in the room of Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Leitrim (North Leitrim Division) and also for the County of Sligo (North Sligo Division), has elected to sit for the County of Sligo (North Sligo Division).—(*Captain Donelan.*) 206

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table a Report from the Counsel to Mr. Speaker, That, in accordance with Standing Order 79 he had conferred with the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords, for the purpose of determining in which House of Parliament the respective Private Bills should be first considered, and they had determined that the Bills contained in the following List should originate in the House of Lords, viz. :—

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway.

Barrie Railway.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bournemouth Corporation.

Bridgewater Canals.

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay.

Clacton Urban District Council.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply.]

Crediton Lighting and Power.

Croydon Corporation Water.

Crystal Palace Company.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.]

Feb. 20.] Page

Dover Corporation.
Dover Harbour Board.
Dover Harbour (Works, &c.).
Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society.
Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.
Folkestone, Sandgate and Hythe Tramways (No. 1).
Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways (No. 2).
Fulwood Urban District Water.
Glamorgan and South Wales Water.
Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.
Great Northern Railway (Ireland).
Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.
Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.
Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.
Haslingden Corporation.
Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.
Holyhead Water.
H. R. Baines and Company.
Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.
Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).
Hull Joint Dock.
Kent Collieries Electricity Supply.
Kent Electric Power.
Kidderminster Gas.
Knot End Railway (Extension of Time).
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.
Llandrindod Wells Gas.
London and North Western Railway.
London Squares and Enclosures.
Manchester Churches.
Manchester and Milford Railway.
Maryport Harbour.
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.
Mersey Railway.
Mid-Derbyshire Railway.

b. 20.] Page
Milford Docks.
Mirfield Gas.
Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.
National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.
Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).
Newport Corporation.
Newport Harbour Commissioners.
Newtownards Urban District Council.
North Sussex Gas and Water.
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.
Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.
Penllwyn Railway and Road.]
Portsmouth Water.
Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.
Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).
Rugby Subordinate School.
Sheffield Assay Office.]
Sheffield District Railway.
Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric power.
South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.
South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).
Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).
Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time).
Thames Harbour.
Trent Navigation Company.
Truro Gas.]
Vauclain's Patent.
Wallasey Tramways and Improvements.
Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.
West Cumberland Electric Tramways.
Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.
West Yorkshire Tramways.
Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).
Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas 206

Feb. 20.] *Pa*

PETITIONS.

Dionysius, Thaddeus.—Petition from Thaddeus Dionysius, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 20

Futteh Din.—Petition from Futteh Din, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 20

Land Values (Assessment and Rating).—Petition from Reading, for legislation, to lie upon the Table 20

Nubia.—Petition from Nubia, son of Hara, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 20

Pillai, John Manook.—Petition from John Manook Pillai, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 20

Sahai, Gajadhar.—Petition from Gajadhar Sahai, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 20

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army Clothing Factory.—Annual Accounts presented, of the Royal Army Clothing Factory for the year 1904–5, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 35] 20

Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues.—Abstract Accounts presented, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 36] 21

Duchy of Lancaster.—Accounts presented, for the year ended 21st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 37] 2

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the City and County of Kingston-upon-Hull and the Town Council of the Borough of Eccles fixing the time of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops; by the Council of the County of Chester, fixing the time of Closing for Barbers' Shops in the Urban Districts of Hazel Grove and Bramhall, and Lower Bebington; and by the Council of the Urban District of Swinton and Pendlebury fixing the time of Closing for Hairdressers' Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 21

Seamen's Savings Banks (Money Orders and Transmission of Wages).—Accounts presented, of all Deposits received and repaid during the year ended 20th November, 1904, and Statement as to Money Orders issued and paid from 1855 to 31st March, 1905, and of Receipts and Payments in connection with the Transmission of Seamen's Wages from 1878 to 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 38] 2

Papers laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—

1. Bank of England, Accounts of Exchequer Bills and other Government Securities purchased, and Amount of Balances of Sums issued for the Payment of Dividends, etc., for the year ending 5th January, 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 39.]

2. Bank of England, Copy of all applications made by the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England for advances to Government authorised by Parliament, from 5th January, 1905, to 5th January, 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 40] 210

ADE AND NAVIGATION.—Accounts ordered, "relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom for each month during the year 1906."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*) 211

EWERS' LICENCES.—Return ordered, "of Accounts of the number of persons in each of the several Collections of the United Kingdom licensed as Brewers for sale, *i.e.*, Common Brewers, Victuallers, Retailers of beer to be drunk on the premises, Retailers of beer not to be drunk on the premises, and Brewers of beer not for sale, particularising each class in each Collection; and of the number of Licences issued to Victuallers and Retailers of beer to be drunk on the premises and not to be drunk on the premises; and stating also the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, &c., sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, &c., hops and hop substitutes, used by brewers of beer for sale and of malt and sugar used by brewers not for sale, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905."

"Of the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, distinguishing Brewers for sale from other Brewers."

"Of the number of Brewers for sale (i.) who use malt and hops, or hop substitutes only, and (ii.) who use malt with substitutes for same and hops or hop substitutes paying for Licences, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, separating them into classes, according to the number of barrels of beer charged with duty calculated at 1·055 degrees gravity, viz.:—under 1,000 barrels; 1,000 and under 10,000; 10,000 and under 20,000; 20,000 and under 30,000; 30,000 and under 50,000; 50,000 and under 100,000; 100,000 and under 150,000; 150,000 and under 200,000; 200,000 and under 250,000; 250,000 and under 300,000; 300,000 and under 350,000; 350,000 and under 400,000; 400,000 and under 450,000; 450,000 and under 500,000; 500,000 and under 600,000; 600,000 and under 700,000; 700,000 and under 800,000; 800,000 and under 900,000; 900,000 and under 1,000,000; 1,000,000 and under 1,500,000; 1,500,000 and under 2,000,000; 2,000,000 barrels and over; showing separately, in each class, the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, &c., sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, &c., hops and hop substitutes used; and stating also the number of bulk barrels of beer produced, and the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged in each class."

"And of the number of barrels of beer exported from the United Kingdom, and the declared value thereof, and where exported to, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, distinguishing England, Scotland, and Ireland (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 26, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. McKenna*) 212

TIONAL GALLERY (REPORT).—Copy ordered, "of Report of the Trustees of the National Gallery for the year 1905, with Appendices."—(*Mr. McKenna*) 212

Feb. 20.] *Pa*

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1904–5.—Copy ordered, "of Accounts of the Civil Contingencies Fund, 1904–5, showing (1) the receipts and payments in connection with the Fund in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1905; (2) the distribution of the capital of the Fund at the commencement and close of the year; together with Copy of the Correspondence with the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon."—(*Mr. McKenna.*) 2

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).—Copy ordered, "of Account of receipts and payments of the Accountant General of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland in respect of the funds of suitors in the said Court, including therein funds to the credit of lunacy accounts, in the year to the 30th day of September, 1905, together with a statement of liabilities and assets and particulars of securities in Court on the 30th day of September, 1905."—(*Mr. McKenna.*) 2

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

TUBERCULOSIS—COMPENSATION FOR COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. John Burns 2

EXAMINATION OF IMPORTED BONELESS MEAT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. John Burns 2

REPORT OF BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. John Burns 2

LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N); Answer, Mr. Bryce 2

SALE OF COLONEL SMYTHE'S ESTATE AT COLLINSTOWN, WEST MEATH.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 2

IRISH LANDLORDS AND COLLECTION OF RACK-RENTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 2

SUPPOSED APPLICATION OF CHRISTOPHER CLINTON FOR COTTAGE AT DELVIN.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 2

TEACHING OF IRISH IN SCHOOLS—WITHDRAWAL OF GRANT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 2

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

WAGES OF POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES.—Questions, Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck) and Mr. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 2

BALLOT FOR BILLS AND MOTIONS.—Ordered, That no Bills, other than Government Bills, be introduced in anticipation of the ballot, and that all Members who desire to ballot, whether for Bills, or Motions for Tuesday, 27th February, and Wednesday, 28th February, and Tuesday, 6th March, and Wednesday, 7th March, do hand in their names at the Table during the sitting of the House on Monday, 19th February, or Tuesday, 20th February, and that a copy of such Notices be handed in, at the latest, during the sitting of the House on Wednesday, 21st February.

That the ballot for the precedence of the said Bills and Motions be taken on Wednesday, 21st February, at a convenient time and place, to be appointed by Mr. Speaker, and that the presentation of Bills on Thursday, 22nd February be taken immediately after Questions.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) 217

ING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed :—Debate resumed.

Mr. Burdett-Coutts (*Westminster*) 217
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 225
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 230
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 237
Mr. William O'Brien (*Cork*) 239
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 247
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 253
Mr. Stuart (*Sunderland*) 256
Mr. Barnes (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) 259
Mr. A. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 265
Mr. Robert Duncan (*Lanarkshire, Govan*) 265
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 266
Mr. Weir (*Ross and Cromarty*) 268
Mr. Bryn Roberts (*Carnarvonshire, Eifion*) 269
Mr. Pike Pease (*Darlington*) 271
Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 273
Mr. Morton (*Sunderland*) 275
Mr. Fell (*Great Yarmouth*) 278
Mr. W. H. Lever (*Cheshire, Wirral*) 279
Mr. Cathcart Wason (*Orkney and Shetland*) 280

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

NG'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson*).

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Cathcart Wason .. ..
Mr. Havelock Wilson (*Middlesbrough*) .. ..
Mr. Bottomley (*Hackney, S.*) .. ..
Mr. Maddison (*Burnley*) .. ..
Mr. Alexander Cross (*Glasgow, Camlachie*) .. ..
Mr. Findlay (*Lanarkshire, N.E.*) .. ..

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the present law and practice in the letting of smaller houses in the burghs of Scotland, and the missive system prevailing in connection therewith, by which tenants are required by landlords in the month of January, or early in February, in each year, to sign a missive form taking their dwelling houses and becoming responsible for the rent thereof, from the term of Whit Sunday until the term of Whit Sunday in the year following, stands in need of immediate amendment and reform, we respectfully submit to Your Majesty that the present practice inflicts great inconvenience and hardship in the cities and larger burghs, especially on these classes who have to change their dwellings at any other time of year than the term of Whit Sunday, and that the reform called for is really in the interest of landlords and their factors as well as of the tenants.' "—(*Mr. Alexander Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Lord Advocate (*Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs*) .. .. ..
Mr. R. Duncan (*Lanarkshire, Govan*) .. ..

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) .. ..
Mr. Tomkinson (*Cheshire, Crewe*) .. ..

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this day.

New Writ.—New Writ for the County of Galway (North Galway Division), in the room of Thomas Higgins, esquire, deceased.—(*Captain Donelan*) ..

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.

ew Writ.—New Writ for the County of Aberdeen (Eastern Division), in the room of James Annand, esquire, deceased,—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*) ..

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath 313

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

rivate Bills [Lords].—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, that, in respect of the Bills comprised in the Report laid upon the Table by Mr. Speaker as intended to originate in the House of Lords, they have certified that the Standing Orders have been complied with in the following cases, viz.:—

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Antofagasta (Chili and Bolivia Railway).

Barry Railway.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bournemouth Corporation.

Bridgewater Canals.

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Railway.

Clacton Urban District Council.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply.

Crediton Lighting and Power.

Croydon Corporation Water.

Crystal Palace Company.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.

Dover Corporation.

Dover Harbour Board.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.).

Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.

Fulwood Urban District Water.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.

Feb. 21.]

Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.

Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.

Haslingden Corporation.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.

Holyhead Water.

H. R. Baines and Company.

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).

Hull Joint Dock.

Kent Collieries Electricity Supply.

Kent Electric Power.

Kidderminster Gas.

Knott End Railway (Extension of Time).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.

Llandrindod Wells Gas.

London and North Western Railway.

London Squares and Enclosures.

Manchester Churches

Manchester and Milford Railway.

Maryport Harbour.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.

Mersey Railway.

Milford Docks.

Mirfield Gas.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

National Assurance Company of Ireland, and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).

Newport Corporation.

Newport Harbour Commissioners.

Newtownards Urban District Council.

North Sussex Gas and Water.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.

Penllwyn Railway and Road.

Portsmouth Water.

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).

Rugby Subordinate School.

Sheffield Assay Office.

Sheffield District Railway.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time)

Thames Harbour.

Trent Navigation Company.

Truro Gas.

Vauclain's Patent.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.

West Yorkshire Tramways.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).

Wolstanton United District Council Gas.

And they have certified that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in the following cases, viz. :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay 313

RIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway [*Lords*].

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay [*Lords*].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 316

Feb. 21.]

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Heacham Water.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).

London United Tramways.

Middlesex County Council (Tramways).

Romford and District Tramways.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Orders.

Additional Electrical Power Supply (London) Bill.—"To incorporate a Company and to confer upon such Company powers for the production, transmission, utilisation, and supply of electrical energy" presented and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill.—"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Ascot District Gas Electric Lighting Bill—"To empower the Ascot District Gas Company to supply electricity ; and to confer further powers on and to change the name of the Company," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. ..

Bacup Corporation Bill.—"To extend the time limited by The Bacup Corporation Water Act, 1898, for the construction of waterworks ; to confer further powers upon the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Bacup in relation to their water and electricity undertakings, and to make further provisions with regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the said borough ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—"To confer further powers on the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Company," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. ..

Bristol Corporation Bill.—"To empower the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the city of Bristol to make a new road ; to alter the wards of the city ; to extend the city and county of Bristol ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time ..

Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill.—"To empower the Brixham Gas Company to supply electricity, and to confer further powers on the company," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bill .. ..

b. 21.]

Page

rry Port Gas and Improvement Bill—"To empower the Urban District Council of Burry Port to supply gas and to make further and better provision with regard to the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

rdiff Gas Bill.—"To confer further powers on the Cardiff Gas Light and Coke Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

rlisle Corporation Bill.—"To empower the Corporation of Carlisle to acquire additional lands for the purposes of their Geltsdale Waterworks; to extend the time for the completion of those works; to authorise the Corporation to borrow further moneys for the purposes of their gas and water undertakings; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

van and Leitrim Railway Bill.—"To enable the Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company, Limited, to make certain extensions of their existing undertaking in the counties of Leitrim and Roscommon; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

aring Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill—"To confer further powers upon the Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Company, Limited," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

eltenham Gas Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Cheltenham Gas Light and Coke Company; and to make further provisions with reference to the undertaking of that company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. ..

ty of London Electric Lighting Bill—."For conferring further powers on the City of London Electric Lighting Company, Limited, and other companies and bodies with respect to the supply of electrical energy; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

rk and Waterford Railways Bill.—"To incorporate the Cork and Waterford Railways Company; and for making railways in the county borough of Cork and in the counties of Cork and Waterford; and to confer running working, agreement, subscription, and other powers on the Company and on certain Railway Companies and others; to authorise certain public bodies to grant guarantees or to subscribe; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

rk City Railways and Works Bill.—"To incorporate the Cork City Railways Company; and to authorise the Company to construct railways and other works in the county borough of Cork; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Feb. 21.]

Cork Link Railways Bill.—" For incorporating the Cork Link Railways Company and for empowering them to construct railways in the county borough of Cork ; and for conferring powers on certain existing railway companies and others ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. ..

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill.—" To empower the Corporation of London to widen Blackfriars Bridge ; to construct a tramway thereover and to confer other powers upon them with respect to that and other bridges ; to authorise agreements between the Corporation and the London County Council ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Derby Gas Bill.—" For extending the limits of supply of the Derby Gas Light and Coke Company ; to enable that Company to acquire the undertakings of the Spondon Ockbrook and Borrowash Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, and the Mickleover and Etwall Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. ..

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill.—" To alter and regulate the capital and borrowing powers of the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Company ; to extend the powers of the Company for the supply of electrical energy within their statutory area ; to make agreements with local authorities, companies, and others for the supply of electricity within such area ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Dowlais Gas Bill.—" For incorporating and conferring powers upon the Dowlais Gas and Coke Company, Limited ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. .. ..

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill.—" To confirm an agreement between the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company and the Dublin and Kingstown Railway Company ; and to confer powers on the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company as to the alteration, conversion, and consolidation of their existing debenture, preference, and ordinary stocks, and as to capital and borrowing powers and other matters ; to change the name of the Company and of their undertaking and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill.—" For conferring further powers upon the Epsom and Ewell Gas Company," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill.—" To remove the restrictions in respect of sulphur compounds (other than sulphuretted hydrogen) now imposed upon certain Gas Companies," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Great Eastern Railway Bill.—" For conferring further powers upon the Great Eastern Railway Company ; for authorising the abandonment of certain works ; for extending the time limited by former Acts ; for the

completion of works and the purchase of lands; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Great Northern Railway Bill.—"To empower the Great Northern Railway Company to construct a railway and other works; and to purchase additional Lands; to extend the time for the completion of works and compulsory purchase of lands by the Company; to authorise the Company to contribute to the cost of the generating station of the Great Northern and City Railway Company; and to raise additional capital; to authorise the construction of a railway and works by the Company and the Great Central Railway Company, and to confirm the purchase of lands by those Companies; to authorise the construction of a railway and works by the South Yorkshire Line Joint Committee, and to revive and extend the powers for the compulsory purchase of certain lands under The North Eastern Railway Act, 1902; to confirm the purchase of certain lands by the Cheshire Lines Committee and to extend the time for the completion of works and the compulsory purchase of lands by that Committee; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Hackney Electricity Bill.—"To make further provision in regard to the supply of electrical energy by and to the mayor, aldermen, and councillors, of the metropolitan borough of Hackney; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time ..

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill.—"For incorporating the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Company; and for empowering them to construct railways in the counties of London and Middlesex; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill.—"To confer powers upon the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust, Limited, for the purpose of enabling that company to develop and lay out lands as garden suburbs," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Huddersfield Corporation Bill.—"To confer further powers on the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the County Borough of Huddersfield with respect to the disposal of trade refuse, for the construction of tramways and street works, and in regard to streets, buildings, sewers, and sanitary matters, and for the health, local government, and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Kettering Water Bill.—"To extend the time for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands authorised by The Kettering Urban District Water Act, 1901, to provide for the transfer of the water undertaking of the Kettering Urban District Council, in the parish of Weekley, to the Kettering Rural District Council; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—"To empower the Corporation of Kingston-upon-Hull to construct a wharf, pier, and railways, to lay down additional tramways, to execute certain street works, and to confer further powers on them in regard to their water and electricity undertakings and the health and improvement of the City; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time

Feb. 21.] *Pag*

Lancashire Electric Power Bill.—" To enlarge the powers of the Lancashire Electric Power Company ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

London and India Docks and Millwall Companies Dock Bill.—" For the amalgamation of the undertaking of the Millwall Dock Company with that of the London and India Docks Company ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.. .. ..

London and South Western Railway Bill.—" To confer further powers upon the London and South Western Railway Company, to authorise them to execute further works, to acquire additional lands, to empower that company and the Midland Railway Company, or one of them, to acquire additional lands in respect of an undertaking in which they are jointly interested, for amalgamating the Waterloo and City Railway Company and the Axminster and Lyme Regis Light Railway Company with the London and South Western Railway Company ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill.—" To confer further powers on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

London County Buildings Bill.—" To empower the London County Council to acquire lands for county offices ; and construct an embankment in the River Thames ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill.—" To confer powers on the London County Council with respect to the supply of electrical energy in the Administrative County of London and neighbouring places ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time.. .. ..

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—" To empower the London County Council to execute works and to acquire lands ; to make provisions as to the drainage of parts of the borough of Hornsey ; to empower the London County Council to establish a street ambulance service ; to confer powers upon the Councils of certain Metropolitan Boroughs ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill.—" To confer further powers on the London Electric Supply Corporation, Limited, with respect to the supply of electrical energy ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ..

London Outer Circle Railway Bill.—" For making a railway between Feltham and the London and India Docks to be called the London Outer Circle Railway ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Feb. 21.] *Page*

London Southern Tramways Bill.—"To authorise the use on the tramways of the London Southern Tramways Company of mechanical power, and to empower that Company to purchase lands and construct works, and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill.—"To incorporate the Macclesfield and District Tramways Company, and to empower that Company to make and maintain tramways and other works in the county of Chester; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Manchester Corporation Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Manchester with reference to the construction of tramways and other works, and the acquisition and appropriation of lands, and with respect to matters affecting the health and good government of the city; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Merthyr Tydfil Gas Bill.—"To authorise the Merthyr Tydfil Gas Company to construct new works; to raise additional capital; to convert their existing capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Metropolitan District Railway Bill.—"To empower the Metropolitan District Railway Company to construct new railways and a subway; to acquire lands; to constitute their surplus lands a separate undertaking; to raise further capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ..

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill.—"To confer further powers on the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company, Limited," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ..

Metropolitan Railway Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Metropolitan Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ..

Metropolitan Water Board Bill.—"To empower the Metropolitan Water Board to make additional waterworks and sewerage and other works, and to dispose of the sewage of certain districts in the valleys of the Rivers Lee and Stort; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill.—"To make further provision for preventing the pollution and obstruction of streams in the county of Middlesex, and to confer further powers on the County Council of Middlesex for that purpose, and in relation to the width and maintenance of roads, employment agencies, ice cream vendors, gipsy encampments, quarter sessions, rating of cemeteries, recreation grounds, Brentford Market, and Runnymede Rifle Range; for amending the London and Middlesex (Adjustment) Scheme, 1905; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Feb. 21.]

Midland Railway Bill.—" To confer additional powers upon the Midland Railway Company for the construction of works, and upon that Company and the Midland and Great Northern Railways Joint Committee for the acquisition of lands, to provide for the vesting of the undertaking of the Halesowen Railway Company in the Midland Railway Company and the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Mid-Oxfordshire Gas Bill.—" For empowering the Mid-Oxfordshire Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, to carry on gas works, and supply gas in certain parts of the county of Oxford; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Millwall Dock Bill.—" To confer further powers upon the Millwall Dock Company with respect to superfluous lands," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

New Mills Urban District Council Bill.—" To authorise the Urban District Council of New Mills to purchase the Ollerset Waterworks Undertaking, and such portion of the waterworks and plant of the Stockport Corporation as is within the district of the Council, and to supply water throughout their district; and to make further provision in regard to the gas undertaking of the Council; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

North and South Shields Electric Railway Bill.—" To enlarge the powers of the North and South Shields Electric Railway Company with reference to the acquisition of lands and the construction of works," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

North-East Lincolnshire Water Bill.—" For incorporating and conferring powers upon the North East Lincolnshire Water Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

North-East London Railway Bill.—" For conferring further powers on the North East London Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

North Metropolitan Tramways Bill.—" To provide for the winding up and dissolution of the North Metropolitan Tramways Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

North-West London Railway Bill.—" For empowering the North West London Railway Company to extend and alter their authorised railways; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. .. ..

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—" For the abandonment of the Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Feb. 21.] *Page*

Peterborough Gas Bill.—"For consolidating the capital of the Peterborough Gas Company; for enabling that Company to acquire additional lands and to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ..

Pontefract Corporation Bill.—"To vest in the Corporation of Pontefract the undertakings of the Pontefract Park Trustees and the Pontefract Gas Company, and to make further provision for the local government of the borough and the water supply thereto; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill.—"To extend the boundaries of the Rathmines and Rathgar Urban District, to confer further powers on the Urban District Council of Rathmines and Rathgar with respect to streets and sanitary and other matters for the improvement and good government of their district; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and order to be read a second time.. .. ..

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Light Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill.—"To authorise the construction of street improvements, the rearrangement of buildings, and the taking of lands in the parish of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, in the county of London; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

St. Pancras Electricity Bill.—"To empower the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of St. Pancras to continue and maintain their stations for generating and transforming electricity; and to amend The St. Pancras (Middlesex) Electric Lighting Order, 1883," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. .. ..

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill.—"To make further provision in regard to the supply of electrical energy by and to the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of Shoreditch; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—"To incorporate the South Lincolnshire Water Company, with power to supply water within certain parishes in the county of Lincoln, and to authorise that company and the Urban District Council of Spalding to construct works and provide water; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time, and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill.—"To empower the South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Company, Limited, to enter into agreements with companies and local authorities with respect to the supply of electrical energy; to confer further powers on the Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. .. ..

Feb. 21.] Page

South Metropolitan Gas Bill.—"To empower the South Metropolitan Gas Company to purchase lands; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

South Suburban Gas Bill.—"To make further provisions with respect to the gas supplied by the South Suburban Gas Company, and the price to be charged therefor; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill.—"To authorise the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company to raise additional capital for carrying out works within the area transferred to and vested in the Company by the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Act, 1905; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills

Southampton Gas Bill.—"To authorise the Southampton Gaslight and Coke Company to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Bill.—"For conferring further powers on the Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Thornton Urban District Gas Bill.—"To empower the Urban District Council of Thornton, in the county of palatine Lancaster, to supply gas, and to provide for the transfer to the Council of such portion of the gas works undertaking and plant of the Poulton-le-Fylde Urban District Council as is contained within the urban district of Thornton; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Todmorden Corporation Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Todmorden in relation to their water, gas, and electric lighting undertakings, to authorise them to provide and work motor omnibuses, and to make further provision with regard to the cleansing and improvement of the River Calder within the borough, and with regard to the health, improvement, and good government of the said borough; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill.—"To confer further powers upon the Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Light and Coke Company; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill.—"To extend the powers of the Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Company, Limited, with respect to the supply of electricity; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Feb. 21.] *Page*

Uxbridge Gas Bill.—"For conferring further powers upon the Uxbridge and Hillingdon Gas Consumers Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Wandsworth and Putney Gas (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill.—"To repeal Section 38, sub-sections (d), (e), and (f) of the Wandsworth and Putney Gas Act, 1900," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill.—"To empower the Corporation of the County Borough of Waterford to acquire the existing toll bridge and ferry rights over the River Suir at Waterford; to enable them to borrow moneys; to empower certain county and district councils to contribute moneys towards the purchase of the said bridge and ferry rights; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—"To extend the time limited by The Watford and Edgware Railway Act, 1903, for the construction of works and the purchase of lands; to authorise agreements between the Watford and Edgware Railway Company and other Companies; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

Watford Gas Bill.—"To consolidate the capital of the Watford Gas and Coke Company; to confer further powers on the company with respect to the raising of additional capital; to extend the limits of supply of the Company; to authorise the Company to acquire by agreement the undertakings of the Chesham Gas and Coke Company, Limited, and the Amersham Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited; to authorise the construction and maintenance of additional gas works; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

West London Electric Undertakers Association Bill—"To authorise the Association of Electric Supply Undertakers in the West of London; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. ..

West Middlesex Roads Bill.—"To authorise the construction of new roads in the urban districts of Brentford and Heston and Isleworth, in the county of Middlesex; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time .. ..

Wigan and Heysham Railway Bill.—"For incorporating the Wigan and Heysham Railway Company, and authorising them to construct railways in the county of Lancaster; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time 316

PETITIONS.

Land Values (Assessment and Rating).—Petition from Whitby, for legislation; to lie upon the Table. 332

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PUBLIC OFFICES SITE (DUBLIN) ACT, 1903.—Account [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 41.] 332

PRISONS (IRELAND).—Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed [No. 42.] 332

WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED SEAMEN.—Accounts [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 43.] 332

TRADE AND NAVIGATION.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 44.] 332

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3522 to 3531 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 332

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 643 and 644 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 332

TREATY SERIES (No. 2, 1906).—Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and France respecting Telegraphic Communication between Mauritius and Réunion. Signed at Paris, 6th December, 1905. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 332

ARMY AND MILITIA.—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 333

MILITARY MANŒUVRES, 1906.—Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council relative to Military Manœuvres, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 333

BREWERS' LICENCES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 45.] 333

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1904-5.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 46.] 333

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 47.] 333

NATIONAL GALLERY (REPORT).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 48.] 333

TRANSVAAL (CHINESE LABOURERS) (CRIMES).—Address for "Return of the Crimes committed by Chinese Labourers who have deserted from the Mines of the Witwatersrand district upon the European or other inhabitants of the Transvaal since June, 1905."—(*Mr. Mackarness*) 333

Feb. 21.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LORD GRENFELL'S APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 334

VOLUNTEER REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Charles McLaren (Leicestershire, Bosworth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 334

ROYAL HIBERNIAN MILITARY SCHOOL—APPOINTMENT OF SERGEANT.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Haldane 335

PROPOSED NATIONAL INDEMNITY COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Russell Rea (Gloucester): Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 335

MILITIA FIELD SERVICE DRESS.—Question, Mr. H. Beaumont (Sussex, Eastbourne); Answer, Mr. Haldane 335

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVY CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hants., Fareham) and Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 336

VOLUNTEER UNIFORM CONTRACTS—ALLEGED SWEATING OF WORKERS.—Questions, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton), Mr. J. R. MacDonald (Leicester), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), and Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) .. 336

THE TRANSVAAL WAR CONTRIBUTION.—Question, Sir Charles McLaren; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 338

NATAL NATIVES AND THE POLL TAX.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 339

SWEDISH MAGNETIC IRON ORE.—Question, Sir Charles McLaren; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs.) 340

FOREIGN OFFICE QUESTIONS.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil), Earl Percy (Kensington, S.), and Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 340

CONGO AND THE SOUDAN FRONTIER.—Questions, Sir Charles McLaren; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 341

ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONGO STATE.—Question, Sir Charles McLaren; Answer, Mr. Runciman 342

HOURS OF POLLING.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 343

LONDON CABMEN'S LICENCE FEES.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone 343

Feb. 21.] *Page*

Musical Piracy.—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland); Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone 343

Foreign Seamen on British Ships.—Question, Mr. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 344

New German Tariff.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), and Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answers, Mr. Lloyd George 345

Labour Statistics—The Unemployed.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd George 345

Maconahy Estate, Longford.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) .. 346

Longford Land Commission Valuer.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 347

Compulsory Purchase Powers.—Questions, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce - .. ..

Cusack Estate, Co. Longford.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Mr. Bryce 348

Trinity College Estates.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 349

Cork Butter Trade.—Questions, Mr. Edward Barry (Cork County, S.) and Mr. William O'Brien (Cork); Answers, Mr. Bryce 349

Police and Irish Evictions.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, Mr. Bryce 350

Irish Board of Agriculture—Mr. Porter's Salary.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.) and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, Mr. Bryce .. 351

Irish National School Rules.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Bryce 352

Sir Horace Plunkett's Position.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 352

Cavan Land Commission.—Question, Mr. Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 355

Sligo Conspiracy Trials.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, W.), and Mr. O'Dowd, (Sligo, S.); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 356

Trinity College Students and the National Anthem.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 357

Longford Post Office.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 357

CLOONAGH AND GRANARD POSTAL DELIVERY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 358

NORTH OF IRELAND MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 358

THE POST OFFICE INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 359

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Ordered, that the Proceedings on the Address in answer to His Majesty's Speech shall, until concluded, have precedence of all other Orders of the Day, and of Notices of Motions, at all Sittings for which they are set down.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) 359

STANDING ORDERS.—Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of thirteen Members:—Sir John Brunner, Mr. Crombie, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Sir Joseph Leese, Colonel Long, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Mildmay, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. James Stuart, and Mr. D. A. Thomas were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.—(*Mr. William Redmond.*) 359

SELECTION.—Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Blake, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Fenwick, Sir Henry Aubrey-Fletcher, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Herbert Roberts, Mr. Eugene Wason, Sir James Woodhouse, and Mr. W. F. D. Smith were nominated Members of the Committee of Selection, together with the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders. —(*Mr. Fenwick.*) 360

NEW BILL.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, under The Metropolitan Police Act, 1886, relating to lands in the Borough of Deptford, and the Royal Borough of Kensington," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; supported by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 1.] 360

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to Mis Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) 361

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that, whereas the punishment of flogging has been abolished, with the happiest results, for upwards of a quarter of a century in Your Majesty's Army, men in Your Majesty's Navy are liable, under the provisions of the Naval Discipline Act, to floggings of twenty-five strokes of a cat-o'-nine-tails, which is a necessary equipment of every one of Your Majesty's ships, while boys and youths in Your Majesty's Navy, under eighteen years of age, are, by Your Majesty's Naval Regulations, for trivial offences, triable, not merely by courts-martial, but summarily liable to floggings "over the bare breech" of twenty-four lashes with birches 9 oz. in weight and steeped in brine, and to twelve strokes of a cane, such birchings and canings, which must be inflicted by the ship's police, in accordance with the Naval Regulations, "in the presence of all the boys" on board ship, being of frequent occurrence; and we further humbly represent that the retention of the system of flogging in Your Majesty's Navy is neither essential to the preservation of discipline, nor consonant with public opinion, and that the abolition by legislation of flogging in the Navy is urgently needed.' "—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee*) .. 362
Mr. Everett (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 363
Captain Hervey (*Bury St. Edmunds*) 363
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 367
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 370
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs*) 371

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 372
Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, S.*) 379

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that large numbers of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Ireland view with alarm the statement that Your Majesty's Ministers have under consideration proposals to effect changes in the system of government in Ireland, believing that Your Majesty's present advisers by their past declarations have committed themselves to a policy which will endanger the liberties and property of the loyalist minority, promote discord and civil strife, and impair the integrity of the United Kingdom.' "—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Joseph Devlin (*Belfast, W.*) 385
Mr. Dodd (*Tyrone, N.*) 394
Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 396
Mr. O'Grady (*Leeds, E.*) 399

Lord Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 400
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 402
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 408

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [21st February] to Main Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*
"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that large numbers of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Ireland view with alarm the statement that Your Majesty's Ministers have under consideration proposals to effect changes in the system of government in Ireland, believing that Your Majesty's present advisers by their past declarations have committed themselves to a policy which will endanger the liberties and property of the loyalist minority, promote discord and civil strife, and impair the integrity of the United Kingdom.' "—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate resumed.

Mr. Charles Craig 411
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.*) 414
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 425
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 433
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 439

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 88 ; Noes, 406. (Division List No. 1.)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising.

Motion made and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

Feb. 22.] *Page*

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

ADDRESS.—The King's Answer to the Address of Monday last reported; and Address and Answer to be printed and published.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Additional Electrical Power Supply (London).

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting).

Bacup Corporation.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.

Barry Railway.

Bethnal Green and Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bridgewater Canals.

Bristol Corporation.

Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting).

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Burry Port Gas and Improvement.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Gas.

Cardiff Railway.

Carlisle Corporation.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway.

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply.

Cheltenham Gas.

City of London Electric Lighting.

Clacton Urban District Council.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges).

Cork City Railways and Works.

Cork Link Railways.

eb. 22.] *Page*

Cork and Waterford Railways.
County of Durham Electric Power Supply.
Crediton Lighting and Power.
Crystal Palace Company.
Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.
Derby Gas.
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power
Dover Corporation.
Dover Harbour Board.
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.).
Dowlais Gas.
Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway.
Epsom and Ewell Gas.
Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society
Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.
Fulwood Urban District Water.
Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).
Glamorgan and South Wales Water.
Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.
Great Eastern Railway.
Great Northern Railway.
Great Northern Railway (Ireland).
Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.
Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.
Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.
Hackney Electricity.
Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway.
Hampstead Garden Suburb.
Haslingden Corporation.
Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.
Holyhead Water.
H. R. Baines and Company.
Huddersfield Corporation.
Hull and Barnsley and Great Cenrtal Railway Companies.
Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).
Hull Joint Dock.

Feb. 22.]

Kent Collieries Electricity Suppl
Kent Electric Power.
Kettering Water.
Kidderminster Gas.
Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation.
Knott End Railway (Extension of Time).
Lancashire Electric Power.
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.
Llandrindod Wells Gas.
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.
London County Buildings.
London County Council (Electric Supply).
London County Council (General Powers).
London Electric Supply Corporation
London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies.
London and North Western Railway.
London Outer Circle Railway.
London and South Western Railway.
London Southern Tramways.
London Squares and Enclosures.
Macclesfield and District Tramways.
Manchester Churches.
Manchester Corporation.
Manchester and Milford Railway.
Maryport Harbour.
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.
Mersey Railway.
Merthyr Tydfil Gas.
Metropolitan District Railway.
Metropolitan Electric Supply
Metropolitan Railway.
Metropolitan Water Board.
Middlesex County Council (General Powers).
Midland Railway.
Mid-Oxfordshire Gas.

Milford Docks.
Millwall Dock.
Mirfield Gas.
Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.
National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.
New Mills Urban District Council.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.
Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).
Newport Corporation.
Newport Harbour Commissioners.
Newtownards Urban District Council.
North East Lincolnshire Water.
North East London Railway.
North Metropolitan Tramways.
North and South Shields Electric Railway.
North Sussex Gas and Water.
North West London Railway.
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.
Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.
Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment).
Penllwyn Railway and Road.
Peterborough Gas.
Pontefract Corporation.
Portsmouth Water.
Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.
Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).
Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement.
Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas.
Rugby Subordinate School.
St. John's (Westminster) Improvement
St. Pancras Electricity.
Sheffield Assay Office.
Sheffield District Railway.
Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity.
Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power.
South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

Feb. 22.] Page

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).

South Lincolnshire Water.

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power.

South Metropolitan Gas.

South Suburban Gas.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company

Southampton Gas.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).

Sutton Southcoates and Drypool Gas.

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time).

Thames Harbour.

Thornton Urban District Gas.

Todmorden Corporation.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas.

Trent Navigation Company.

Truro Gas.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply.

Uxbridge Gas.

Vauclain's Patent.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements.

Wandsworth and Putney Gas (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge.

Watford and Edgware Railway.

Watford Gas.

West London Electric Undertakers' Association.

West Middlesex Roads.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.

Wigan and Heysham Railway.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have not been complied with :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay (Dover).

Heacham Water.

Page

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).

London United Tramways.

Middlesex County Council (Tramways).

Romford and District Tramways.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 449

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RADE REPORTS.—I. (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3522. Cuba (Trade 1904 (Supplementary)).

No. 3523. Germany (German Trade with India).

No. 3524. Netherlands (Finances of the Netherland Indies).

No. 3525. Denmark (Trade 1904 (Supplementary)).

No. 3526. Germany (Bavaria).

No. 3527. Netherlands (Finances of the Netherlands).

No. 3528. France (Indo-China).

No. 3529. Servia (Trade 1904).

No. 3530. Italy (South Italy).

No. 3531. Mexico (Mexican Budget) 454

I. (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 643. United States (Coal Industry of the United States in 1904).

No. 644. France (Report on the French Octroi System) 454

REATY SERIES, No. 2 (1906).—Convention between United Kingdom and France respecting telegraphic communication between Mauritius and Réunion; signed at Paris, 6th December, 1905. (Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906) 454

IGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

Light railways in the borough of Great Grimsby and in the rural district of Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln (parts of Lindsey) from Great Grimsby to Immingham.

Light railways in the borough of Newark and in the rural district of Newark in the county of Nottingham.

A light railway in the county of Chester, from Tarporley to a junction with the railway of the Cheshire Lines Committee near Mouldsworth.

Light railways in the urban district of Seaham Harbour and in the rural districts of Easington and of Sunderland, in the county of Durham.

Feb. 22.] *Page*

II. Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of light railways in the borough of Bideford, and from Landcross to Clovelly and Hartland, all in the county of Devon 454

PRISONS (INTERNATIONAL PENITENTIARY CONGRESS AT BUDA PESTH, 1905).—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Sir E. Ruggles-Brise, K.C.B., Chairman of the Prison Commission for England and Wales, and British Delegate on the Proceedings of the Seventh International Penitentiary Congress held at Buda Pesth in 1905 455

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.—Annual Report of the Chief Inspectors of Factories and Workshops for the year 1904. Part II., Statistics 455

ARMY.

(Military Manœuvres, 1906).—Draft Order in Council relative to Military Manœuvres, 1906.

(Army and Militia).—Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation, for the year ended September 30th, 1905.

resented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 455

ST. VINCENT.—Rules for the Government of the prison in St. Vincent 4

TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS.—Rules and regulations for the administration of the Central Prison, Grand Turk 455

SEAMEN'S SAVINGS BANKS (MONEY ORDERS, AND TRANSMISSION OF WAGES).—Account of all deposits received and repaid by the Board of Trade, on account of Seamen's Savings Banks, under the authority of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, during the year ended November 20th, 1905, and of the interest thereon ; statement showing the number and amount of seamen's money orders, issued and paid at ports in the United Kingdom, and at ports abroad from 1855 to March 31st, 1905 ; also, statement showing the receipts and payments in connection with the transmission of seamen's wages, home and foreign, from 1878 to March 31st, 1905 456

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Order directing that the several Orders for the time being in force for regulating the proceedings of the boards of guardians, and the keeping and auditing of accounts, etc., shall, so far as the same are applicable thereto, govern the proceedings of the boards of management of the district schools at Trim and Glin.
General order amending the Dispensing Rules 456

COUNTY COURTS ENGLAND (FEES).—Treasury Order, dated February 22nd, 1906, amending the Order of December 30th, 1903, regulating court fees in county courts.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 456

THE FISCAL QUESTION.

The Duke of Devonshire 456
The Earl of Granard 466

The Marquess of Lansdowne 468
Viscount Goschen 477
The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) 481

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.
One other Member took and subscribed the Oath. 486

PETITIONS.

DMIRALTY (DISABLED SAILORS AND MARINES).—Petition from Canterbury, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 486

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING).—Petitions for legislation, from Hebdon Bridge, Falmouth, Mossley, and Nottingham; to lie upon the Table 487

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.—Petition from London, for reduction; to lie upon the Table 487

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CHELSEA HOSPITAL.—Account [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 49.] 487

SAVINGS BANKS (INVESTMENT) REGULATIONS.—Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 50.] 487

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 51.] 487

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.—Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1904, Part II. (Statistics) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 487

PRISONS (INTERNATIONAL PENITENTIARY CONGRESS AT BUDA-PESTH, 1905).—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Sir E. Ruggles-Brise, K.C.B., Chairman of the Prison Commission for England and Wales, and British Delegate, on the Proceedings of the Seventh International Penitentiary Congress held at Buda-Pesth in 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 487

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of General Order amending the Dispensary Rules [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 487

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Order directing that the several Orders for the time being in force for regulating the proceedings of Boards of Guardians, and the keeping and auditing of accounts, etc., shall as far as the same are applicable thereto govern the proceedings of the Boards of Management of the District Schools at Trim and Glin [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 488

Feb. 22.] Page

COUNTY COURTS, ENGLAND (FEES).—Copy presented, of Treasury Order, dated 22nd February, 1906, amending the Order of 30th December, 1903, regulating Court Fees in County Courts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 488

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1905–6).—Estimates presented of the further amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1906, for Temporary Commissions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 52.] 488

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Great Grimsby, and in the rural district of Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey), from Great Grimsby to Immingham (Grimsby District Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 488

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railways Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Newark and in the rural district of Newark, in the county of Nottingham (Newark and District Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 488

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the Borough of Bideford and from Landcross to Clovelly and Hartland, all in the county of Devon (Bideford, Clovelly, and Hartland Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 488

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Chester from Tarporley to a junction with the Railway of the Cheshire Lines Committee near Mouldsworth (Tarporley Light Railway Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 489

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Seaham Harbour and in the rural districts of Easington and of Sunderland, in the County of Durham (Ryhope, Seaham, Murton, and South Hetton Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 489

INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENTS).—Return ordered, "Of the number of Assessments to the Income-Tax for the years ending the 5th day of April, 1904, and the 5th day of April, 1905 (in the same classes and in the same amounts as stated in and in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 179, of Session 1905)." —(*Mr. Samuel Evans*) 489

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

REPORT ON THE CRINAN CANAL.—Question, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 489

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT—SUGGESTED TREASURY GRANT.—Question, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 490

ENTRIES ON SOLDIERS' DEFAULT SHEETS.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Haldane 490

COLONEL POLLOCK'S SCHEME OF ARMY TRAINING.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 490

ARMY RECRUITING IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 491

SOUTH AFRICAN GARRISON.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Haldane 491

POSITION OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Mr. Haldane 492

POST OFFICE WAGES COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Buxton 492

TENURE AND TRUSTS OF PREMISES FOR VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Birrell 492

INDIAN CIVIL OFFICIALS—EXTENSION OF LEAVE CAUSED BY LATENESS OF STEAMERS.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley 493

SCARCITY OF BOATS ON THE ROYAL CANALS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. M'Kenna 493

THE PRESS AND COURT MARTIAL ON STAFF SERGEANT-MAJOR HILTON.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 494

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SAILORS AS RAILWAY PASSENGERS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 495

LORD CAWDOR'S MEMORANDUM.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 495

THE "ASSISTANCE" COURT-MARTIAL.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 496

ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) and Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 497

NORTHERN NIGERIA—SALE OF CHILDREN—SALT TAX.—Question, Mr. Brunner (Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, The Under-Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 498

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL—RE-ENLISTMENT.—Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 498

Feb. 22.] Page

ARRIVAL OF CHINESE IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Samuel Robert (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. Churchill 499

COOLIE LABOUR REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts; Answer, Mr. Churchill 499

LORD MILNER—CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN SOUTH AFRICAN MINES.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 499

TREATMENT OF THE WITWATERSRAND COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Churchill 500

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Questions, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Churchill 500

THE TRANSVAAL WAR CONTRIBUTION.—Questions, Mr. Dalziel; Answers, Mr. Churchill 501

BRITISH GUIANA—INDIAN LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, Mr. Churchill 502

BRITISH COMMERCIAL REPRESENTATION IN CANADA.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 502

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN CEYLON.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 503

EDUCATION OF INDIAN COOLIE CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. John Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 503

CHINA—THIBETAN TREATY.—Question, Mr. Norman and Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) and the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 503

CONSULAR REPORTS—COMMERCIAL INFORMATION.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Mr. Runciman 504

WEI-HAI-WEI.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Mr. Runciman 505

COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX—SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) and Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 505

CHILD INSURANCES.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 506

NSPECTION OF LAUNDRIES.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 507

FOREIGN SAILORS IN THE MERCANTILE MARINE—CASE OF THE "ORDOVICIAN." Question, Mr. J. Havelock Wilson (Middlesbrough); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 507

Feb. 22.] *Page*

Joint Stock Companies Acts.—Questions, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 508

Pollution of the Thames.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 509

Payment of the Education Grant.—Question, Mr. J Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 509

Securing of Seats in the House—Midnight Arrivals.—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny), Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) and Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 510

Sale of Bills Office.—Questions, Mr. Alexander Cross; Answers, Mr. Harcourt 511

Roscommon County Councils and the Financial Year.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 512

Cork Butter Trade.—Question, Mr. William O'Brien (Cork); Answer, Mr. Bryce 513

County Infirmary Committees.—Question, Mr. Hayden; Answer, Mr. Bryce 513

Use of Irish Language.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Bryce .. 514

Hickman Estate, County Clare.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 515

Irish Language in Irish Schools.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. J. Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Bryce 515

Outrage in County Derry.—Questions, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) and Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 516

Infantile Mortality in the North Dublin Workhouse.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 517

Jeremiah Dunn's Estate—Queen's County.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 517

Clonkeen Evictions.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Bryce 517

Irish Local Government Board.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 518

Limerick Postman's Grievance.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 518

Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Disorders.—Question, Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 519

System of Taking Divisions in the House.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 519

Feb. 22.] *Page*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—MACHINERY AND SECOND BALLOT.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 519

COUNTY MAGISTRACY.—Question, Mr. Boulton (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 520

THE LADIES' GALLERY.—THE GRILLE—Questions, Mr. Norman, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 520

THE FISCAL DEBATE.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 521

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.); Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.) and Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 522

NEW BILLS.

Ecclesiastical Disorders Bill.—"To deal with Ecclesiastical Disorders in the Church of England," presented by Mr. Carlile; supported by Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Channing, Dr. Hazell, Mr. David MacIver, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. W. W. Rutherford, Colonel Sandys, Major Seely, and Mr. Austin Taylor; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 2] 523

Land Tenure Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Tenure of Land," presented by Mr. Agar-Robartes; supported by Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Soares, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Hay Morgan, Mr. Newnes, and Mr. Montagu; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 3] .. 524

Land Values Taxation, &c. (Scotland) Bill.—"To provide for the Taxation for local purposes of Land Values in Scotland and for the compulsory Acquisition of Land by Local Authorities in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Sutherland; supported by Mr. Cleland, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Findlay, Mr. John Hope, Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Watt, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 4] 524

Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Trades Unions and Trade and other Disputes," presented by Mr. Hudson; supported by Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Wilkie, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Gill, Mr. Snowden, Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Hodge, and Mr. Walsh; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 5].. 524

Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Diseases of Animals Act, 1896, with regard to the importation of Canadian live cattle," presented by Mr. Cairns; supported by Mr. H. Greenwood, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. J. Allen Baker, Mr. Hubert Beaumont, and Mr. Halley Stewart; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 6] 524

Feb. 22.] Page

Light Dues (Abolition Bill).—"To abolish Light Dues now chargeable on ships in the United Kingdom," presented by Sir Robert Ropner; supported by Mr. Russell Rea, Mr. James Walton, Mr. Cairns, Mr. Walter Rea, Mr. Houston, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Lambton, and Mr. Charles Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 7] 524

Pure Beer Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the manufacture and sale of Beer," presented by Mr. Courthope; supported by Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Mr. Bridgeman, and Mr. Robert Price; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 8] 525

Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, and otherwise to facilitate the building of Houses for the Working Classes in rural districts," presented by Mr. Mackarness; supported by Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Channing, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. Soames, Mr. Rowlands, Mr. Strauss, and Mr. Morrell; to be read a second time upon Friday, 27th April, and to be printed. [Bill 9] 525

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.—"To amend the Education Acts, 1902 and 1903," presented by Mr. W. T. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 10] 525

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—"To limit the hours of work below ground in Coal Mines," presented by Mr. Brunner; supported by Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Norman, Mr. Joseph Walton, Mr, Hall, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. John Hope, and Mr. Howell Davies; to be read a second time upon Friday, 11th May, and to be printed. [Bill 11] 525

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—"To improve the position of Tenants in Towns in Ireland," presented by Mr. M'Killop; supported by Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Charles Devlin, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; to be read a second time upon Friday, 18th May, and to be printed. [Bill 12] 525

Pilotage Bill.—"To amend The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in respect of Pilotage Certificates," presented by Mr. Howell Davies; supported by Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Godfrey Baring, Sir William Evans-Gordon, Mr. Bateman Hope, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Levy Lever, Sir George Newnes, and Sir Gilbert Parker; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 13] 526

Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill.—"To enable Women to be elected and act as members of county and borough councils and Metropolitan borough councils," presented by Mr. Silcock; supported by Dr. Shipman, Mr. Alden, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Spicer, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. H. J. Wilson, and Mr. Yoxall; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 14] 526

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—"To deal with the Registration of Voters in Ireland," presented by Mr. Charles Devlin; supported by Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Doogan, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Mooney, and Mr. Kennedy; to be read a second time upon Friday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 15] 526

Feb. 22.] *Pag*

Coal Mines Regulation Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Coal Mines," presented by Mr. Compton Rickett; supported by Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Wadsworth, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Brace, Mr. Walton, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Glover, and Mr. Jacoby; to be read a second time upon Friday, 11th May, and to be printed. [Bill 16] 526

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Local Government (Ireland) Acts," presented by Mr. Joseph Devlin; supported by Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh; Mr. Conor O'Kelly, Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th June, and to be printed. [Bill 17] 526

Old Age Pensions Bill.—"To provide Pensions for the Aged Deserving Poor," presented by Mr. J. W. Wilson; supported by Mr. Goddard, Mr Claude Hay, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Mr. W. H. Lever, Mr. Remnant, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 18.] 527

Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill.—"To grant Certificates to Persons in charge of Engines and Boilers in and about Mines," presented by Mr. William Johnson; supported by Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Bell, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Wilson, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Walton, Mr. Compton Rickett Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Enoch Edwards; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 19.] 527

Compulsory Weighing and Measurement Bill.—"To provide for the Weighing and Measurement of the material used in the process of manufacture, as well as the product thereof, in all iron or steel works, cement works, lime works, and chalk quarries," presented by Mr. Barnes; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 20.] 527

Contempt of Court (Ireland) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Contempt of Court in Ireland," presented by Mr. Nolan; supported by Mr Patrick Aloysius McHugh, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Farrell; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 21.] 527

Parliamentary Elections (Disqualification Removal) Bill.—"To remove certain Disqualifications at Parliamentary Elections," presented by Mr. Marnham; supported by Mr. Croydon Marks, Mr. Cowan, and Mr. Brodie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 22.] 527

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister," presented by Mr. Barker; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 23.] 528

Parliamentary Elections (Hours of Poll) Bill.—"To extend the Hours of Polling at Parliamentary Elections," presented by Mr. Pickersgill; supported by Sir Edwin Cornwall, Mr. Dickinson, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. B. S Straus, and Mr. Wiles; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 24.] 528

Feb. 22.]

Page

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1889) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889," presented by Major Anstruther-Gray; supported by Mr. George Younger, Mr. Cochrane, Sir John Tuke, and Mr. Eugene Wason; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 25.] 528

Marine Works (Ireland) Bill.—"To deal with Marine Works in Ireland," presented by Mr. O'Hare, supported by Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Joyce, Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. O'Malley, and Mr. McKillop; to be read a second time upon Friday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 26.] 528

Irish Lights Commission Bill.—"To amend the constitution of the Irish Lights Commission," presented by Mr. Charles Mooney; supported by Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Field; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th June, and to be printed. [Bill 27.] 528

Aged Pensioners Bill.—"To provide Pensions for the Aged Deserving Poor," presented by Mr. Samuel Roberts; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 28.] 528

Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill.—"To establish a Single Franchise at all Elections and thereby to abolish University Representation and to remove the Disabilities of Women," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Byles, Mr. Keir-Hardie, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Money, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Sheehan, and Mr. P. W. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 29.] 528

Metropolitan Police (Dublin) Bill.—"To deal with the Metropolitan Police in Dublin," presented by Mr. Kennedy, supported by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Waldron, and Mr. Field; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 30.] 529

Wages Boards Bill.—"To provide for the establishment of Wages Boards," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Alden, Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Harold Tennant, Mr. Trevelyan, and Mr. P. W. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 31.] 529

Trades Unions and Trade Disputes (No. 2) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Trades Unions and Trades Disputes," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Keir Hardie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 32.] 529

Public Trustee and Executor Bill.—"To provide for the appointment of a Public Trustee and Executor," presented by Sir C. E. Howard Vincent; supported by Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Isaacs, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Broadhurst, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 33.] 529

Merchandise Marks Bill.—"To amend the sixteenth section of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Middlemore, Sir Frederick Carne Rasch, Mr. Field, Sir Benjamin Stone, Sir Francis Lowe, and Mr. Parkes; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 34.] 529

Feb. 22.] *Page*

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—"To make further provisions for Local Government in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. George Younger; supported by Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Eugene Wason, Major Anstruther Gray, Mr. W. M. Thomson, and Mr. Crombie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 35.] 530

Licensing (Scotland) Amendment Bill.—"To provide for the later opening of premises licensed for the sale of excisable liquors in Scotland," presented by Mr. Findlay; supported by Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Robert Balfour, Mr. Cross, Mr. Gulland, and Mr. Sutherland; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 8th March, and to be printed. [Bill 36.] 530

Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill—"To enable Courts to suspend the Certificates of Trawlers convicted of illegal Trawling," presented by Mr. Weir; supported by Mr. Morton, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Black, Mr. Annan Bryce, and Mr. Sutherland; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 37.] 530

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland on Saturdays and Sundays; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Sloan; supported by Mr. William Redmond, Captain Donelan, Mr. Gordon, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Glendinning, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Thomas Smith; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 38.] 530

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900," presented by Mr. Jackson; supported by Mr. Nield, Mr. Idris, Mr. Waterlow, and Mr. Money; to be read a second time upon Friday, 27th April, and to be printed. [Bill 39.] 530

Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill.—"To prevent the disfranchisement of persons receiving Poor Law Relief," presented by Mr. Charles E. Schwann; supported by Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Brotherton, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Mr. J. M. Robertson, and Mr. John Johnson; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 40.] 531

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881, and to make further provision for the sale of intoxicating liquors in Wales and Monmouthshire," presented by Mr. Herbert Roberts; supported by Sir Alfred Thomas and Mr. William Jones; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 41.] 531

Land Values (Assessment and Rating) Bill.—"To provide for the Assessment and Rating of Land Values," presented by Mr. Trevelyan; supported by Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Bell, Sir John Brunner, Mr. William Jones, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. McCrae, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Whitley, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 42.] 531

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

Feb. 22.] *Page*

" *Most Gracious Sovereign,*

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament: "—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) 532
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 544

Amendment proposed—

" At the end of the Question, to add the words, ' But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end."—(*Mr. H. W. Forster.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Churchill, Oldham*) .. 554
Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 572
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercomby*) 582
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 583

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [22nd February] to Question [19th February], " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

" *Most Gracious Sovereign,*

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

" At the end of the Question, to add the words, ' But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end.' "—(*Mr. H. W. Forster.*)

Question again proposed, " That those words be there added."

Debate resumed.

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 587
Sir Edward Clarke (*City of London*) 593
Mr. Toulmin (*Bury, Lancashire*) 595
Mr. Houston (*Liverpool, West Toxteth*) 599
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 603
Mr. Markham (*Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*) 604
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 606
Colonel Legge (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 611
Mr. Belloc (*Salford, S.*) 614
Mr. Bridgeman (*Shropshire, Oswestry*) 614

Motion made, and Question, " That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow,

Ordered, That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of fifteen members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of, Mr. Ashton, Mr. Blake, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Holden, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Snowden, and Colonel Williams.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*).. 620

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL).—Petitions in favour; from Burslem, Greenock, and Hanley; to lie upon the Table 621

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.—Petition from London, for reduction; to lie upon the Table 621

Feb. 23.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).—Copy presented, of further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 621

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Wakefield and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the city [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 621

PRISONS (PHOTOGRAPHS AND MEASUREMENTS OF PRISONERS).—Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 22nd February, 1906, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, under Section 8 of the Penal Servitude Act, 1891, applying the provisions of the Regulations, dated 20th June, 1896, relating to the Measuring and Photographing of Prisoners to any Alien in respect of whom a certificate has been given under Section 3 (1) of The Aliens Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 621

CONSOLIDATED FUNDS.—Abstract Account presented, showing the issues made from the Consolitated Fund of the United Kingdom in the financial year ended 31st March, 1905, for the interest and management of the Debt, for the Civil List, and for all other issues in the financial year for services charged directly on the said Fund; with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 53] 621

GREEK LOAN.—Accounts presented, up to 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 54] 622

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 645 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 622

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions, Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to be printed [No. 55.]

Building Societies, Copy of Eleventh Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, etc. [by Act]; to be presented. [No. 56] 622

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS (INCLUDING TELEPHONES).—Copy ordered, "of Account showing the gross amount received and the gross amount expended in respect of the Telegraph Service, including Telephones, from the date of the Transfer of the Telegraphs to the State to the 31st day of March, 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 124, of Sessions 1905)."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) 622

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (NON-PROVIDED SCHOOL).—Return ordered, "of the Schools in England and Wales recognised on the 1st day of January 1906, as Non-Provided Public Elementary Schools, showing as far as practicable the tenure of the premises of such Schools and the character of the trusts, if any, to which the premises are subject under any trust deeds or instruments or otherwise."—(*Mr. Birrell.*) 622

Feb. 23.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Welsh Tithes.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 623

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies—Supplementary Estimates.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Churchill 623

Drainage of Lough Neagh—Report of Sir A. Binnie.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 623

Criminal Proceedings against Mr. H. Pless.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Churchill 623

Adjournment.—Resolved, That this House do, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn until Monday next.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*) 624

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [22nd February] to Main Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly regret that your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method of bringing it to an end.'"—(*Mr. H. W. Forster.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate resumed:

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 625
Earl Percy (*Kensington, S.*) 634
Mr. Mond (*Chester*) 650
Mr. J. Ward (*Stoke-on-Trent*) 659
Mr. Dunn (*Cornwall, Camborne*) 662
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 667
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 678

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 91; Noes, 416. (Division List No. 2.)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising—

And it being after half-past Five of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

NEW BILLS.

JURORS' EXPENSES.—Bill to provide for the payment of the Expenses of Jurors attending assizes and quarter sessions in England and Wales, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. Moss, Mr. Hay Morgan, and Mr. Bertram.

Jurors' Expenses Bill.—"To provide for the payment of the Expenses of Jurors attending assizes and quarter sessions in England and Wales," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 43.] 699

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT (1893) AMENDMENT.—Bill to amend The Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1893; and for other purposes relating thereto, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Courtenay Warner, and Mr. Luttrell.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act (1893) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1893; and for other purposes relating thereto," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 44.] 699

SMALL HOLDINGS.—Bill to further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. George White, Mr. Lyell, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Luttrell, Sir John Jardine, and Mr. Cobbold.

Small Holdings Bill.—"To further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 45.] 699

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES).—Bill to amend the Law relating to Coroners' Inquests in the case of Fatal Accidents on Railways, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Bell, Mr. Charles E. Schwann, and Mr. Hudson.

Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Coroners' Inquests in the case of Fatal Accidents on Railways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 46.] 700

OLD AGE PENSIONS (NO. 2).—Bill to provide Pensions for persons over sixty-five years of age, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Sir Walter Foster.

Old Age Pensions (No. 2) Bill.—"To provide Pensions for persons over sixty-five years of age," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 47.] 700

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Accrington District Gas and Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Channel Ferry Railway and Quay Bill [H.L.]; Clacton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Dover Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Dover Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill [H.L.]; Fulwood Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [H.L.]; Haslington Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill [H.L.]; London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Churches Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill [H.L.]; Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [H.L.]; Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [H.L.]; Rugby Subordinate School Bill [H.L.]; Thames Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Vauclain's Patent Bill [H.L.]; Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]. Presented, and read 1ª 701

Alexandra (Newport) and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase) Bill [H.L.]; Bridgewater Canals Bill [H.L.]; Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Crediton Lighting and Power Bill [H.L.]; Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]; Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society Bill [H.L.]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill [H.L.]; Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies Bill [H.L.] Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [H.L.]; Holyhead Water Bill [H.L.]; H. R. Baines & Company Bill [H.L.]; Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.]; Hull Joint Dock Bill [H.L.]; Kent Collieries Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Kent Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Kidderminster Gas Bill [H.L.]; Knott End Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; Manchester and Milford Railway Bill [H.L.]; Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Railway Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]; Mirfield Gas Bill [H.L.]; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill [H.L.]; National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; North Sussex Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill [H.L.]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Portsmouth Water Bill [H.L.]; Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Assay Office Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [H.L.]; Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric

Feb. 26.] *Page*

Power Bill [H.L.]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Trent Navigation Company Bill [H.L.]; Truro Gas Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Presented; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners 701

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (1905–6) (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE).—Estimate of the further amount required during the year ended 31st March, 1906, beyond the sum already provided in the grant for Navy Services for the year 703

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.—No. 645. Germany (Agriculture in Germany) 703

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).—Further Papers regarding the administration of the Army in India (in continuation of Cd. 2718.]) 703

VAGRANCY.—Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy. Volume 1 703

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.—Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors, for the year ended 31st December, 1905 703

ROUMANIA: NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF (INTERIM STATEMENT).—Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by the commercial treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany, together with a summary of the new law relating to tare on goods dutiable by weight.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 703

LUNACY.—Return of all sums received by the visitors of lunatics for travelling expenses or upon any other account from the 1st January to the 31st December, 1905 703

BUILDING SOCIETIES.—Eleventh Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the registrars under the Building Societies Acts; with an abstract of the annual accounts and statements of societies for the year 1905 703

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES' WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES, AND TRADE UNIONS.—Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December, 1905 704

GREEK LOAN OF 1832.—Account for 1905 704

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Orders made by the councils of the following county borough and city, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain shops in the county borough of Southport; city of Wakefield 704

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).—Report to His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department by G. A. Bonner, Esq., Barrister-at-law, on the draft regulations proposed to be made for the processes of spinning and weaving flax and tow, and the processes incidental thereto 704

Feb. 26.] *Page*

PENAL SERVITUDE ACT, 1891 (MEASURING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF PRISONERS).—Regulations, dated 22nd February, 1906, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 8 of the Penal Servitude Act, 1891, applying the provisions of the regulations dated 20th June, 1896, relating to the measuring and photographing of prisoners, to any alien in respect of whom a certificate has been given under Section 3(1) of the Aliens Act, 1891 704

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND) ACCOUNTS, 1904–1905).—Accounts of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, and from 26th July, 1869 (date of the Irish Church Act) to 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon 704

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.—Regulations made by the Local Government Board under the Act—Regulations for carrying the Act into effect made under Section 4 3) of the Act (Principal Regulations); Regulations temporarily modifying the principal regulations; Regulations amending the principal regulations in regard to the record paper 704

SUPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury minutes, granting under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act retired allowances to—Walter Robert Hoyles (Principal Foreman, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office). (19th February, 1906); William Walter Kellaway (late Engineer (1st class) Engineer-in-Chief's Department, Post Office). (20th February, 1906); Lewis Robert Ambrose, Claudius Robert Brock, Harry Clarke, Henry Eden, Henry Haley, James William Jater, William James Jater, William Samuel Priest, William Taylor, Overseers and Senior Telegraphists, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887. (20th February, 1906.)

II. Treasury minute, declaring Hanoi Tonquin French Indo-China, to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1896. (26th February, 1906) 705

NATIONAL DEBT (MILITARY SAVINGS BANK).—An account of the gross amount of all moneys received and paid by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, on account of "the Fund of Military Savings Bank," from 19th September, 1845, to 5th January, 1906 705

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.—Report of the proceedings of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks, for the year ended 20th November, 1905; with Appendices. Fourteenth Annual Report 705

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.—Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, establishing two residentiary canonries in the Cathedral Church of Newcastle, in addition to the two established by Order in Council of 26th November, 1900 705

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.—Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, exempting certain mixtures of picric acid from all restrictions under the Explosives Act, 1875, when kept and conveyed in manner specified 705

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, entitled "The Southern Nigeria Protectorate Order in Council, 1906."

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 705

NEW BILLS.

Marine Insurance Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to codify the law relating to marine insurance 706

Prevention of Corruption Bill.—A Bill for the better prevention of corruption:

Were presented by the Earl of Halsbury; read 1a, and to be printed .. 706

THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.

Viscount Milner 706
Lord Harris 721
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Elgin) 734
The Duke of Marlborough 748

Moved, That the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned till to-morrow.

House adjourn at ten minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred to on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Cardiff Gas Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Great Eastern Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill; Merthyr Tydfil Gas Bill; Metropolitan District Railway Bill; Metropolitan Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill; Millwall Dock Bill; North Metropolitan Tramways Bill; North West London Railway Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; South Suburban Gas Bill; Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Watford Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 758

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH). Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz. :—City of London Electric Lighting Bill ; Dowlais Gas Bill ; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill ; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill ; West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 758

Bacup Corporation Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 759

Carlisle Corporation Bill; Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 759

Kettering Water Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 759

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Monday next 759

Metropolitan Water Board Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 759

New Mills Urban District Council Bill, Thornton Urban District Gas Bill, Todmorden Corporation Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 759

Wigan and Heysham Railway Bill.—Read a second time, and committed.. 759

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee, not exceeding eleven members, to be called the Police and Sanitary Committee, to whom shall be committed all private Bills promoted by municipal and other local authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 150 and 137A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee shall report to the Committee of Selection that any Clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than Clauses containing police and sanitary regulations) are such, as having regard to the terms of reference it is not in their opinion necessary or advisable for them to deal with, the Committee of Selection shall thereupon refer the Bill to a Select Committee, who shall consider those Clauses and so much of the Preamble of the Bill as relates thereto, and shall determine the expenditure (if any) to be authorised in respect of the parts of the Bill referred to them. That the Committee shall deal with the remaining Clauses of such Bill, and so much of the Preamble as relates thereto, and shall determine the period and mode of repayment of any money authorised by the Select Committee to be borrowed, and shall report the whole Bill to the House, stating in their report what parts of the Bill have been considered by each Committee.

'eb. 26.] *Page*

Ordered, That the Committee have power if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to the instructions which apply to, the undivided Committee, and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*) 759

PETITIONS.

DMIRALTY (DISABLED SAILORS AND MARINES).—Petition from Carlisle, for alteration of law ; to lie upon the Table 760

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.—Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1905 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table .. 760

RUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.—Copy presented, of Fourteenth Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Inspection Committee for the year ended 20th November, 1905, with Appendices [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 57.] 760

ATIONAL DEBT (MILITARY SAVINGS BANKS).—Account presented, of the Gross Amount of all Moneys received and paid by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt on account of the Fund for Military Savings Banks, from 19th September, 1845, to the 5th January, 1906 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 58] 761

UPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes granting a retired allowance to each of the following, viz. :—

William Walter Kellaway, late Engineer (1st Class), Engineer in Chief's Department, Post Office.

Walter Robert Hoyles, Principal Foreman, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office.

Lewis Robert Ambrose, Claudius Robert Brock, Harry Clarke, Henry Eden, Henry Haley, James William Jater, William James Jater, William Samuel Priest, William Taylor, Overseers and Senior Telegraphists, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table .. 761

UPERANNUATION ACTS, 1858 AND 1876.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th February, 1906, declaring Hanoi, Tonquin, French Indo-China, to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table 761

AVY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1905–6).—Copy presented, of Estimate of the Further Amount required during the year ending 31st March, 1906, beyond the sum already provided in the Grant for Navy Services for the year [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 59] 761

ACTORY AND WORKSHOP (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by G. A. Bonnar, esquire, barrister-at-law, on the Draft Regulations proposed to be made for the processes of spinning and weaving Flax and Tow, and the processes incidental thereto [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table .. 761

Feb. 26.] *Page*

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Southport and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 762

Vagrancy.—Copy presented of Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy, Vol. I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 762

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.—Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Local Government Board under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 762

Newcastle Chapter Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, establishing two residentiary Canonries in the Cathedral Church of Newcastle in addition to the two established by Order in Council of 26th November, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 762

Explosives Act, 1875.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, exempting certain mixtures of Picric Acid from all restrictions under the Explosives Act, 1875, when kept and conveyed in manner specified [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 762

Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, entitled, "The Southern Nigerian Protectorate Order in Council, 1906," [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 762

Roumania (New Customs Tariff) (Interim Statement).—Copy presented, of Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by Commercial Treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany; together with a summary of the New Law relating to tare on goods dutiable by weight (by Command]; to lie upon the Table 762

Post Office Telegraphs.—Copy presented, of the Telegraphs (Inland Written Telegraph) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1906, dated 1st January, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 763

Paper Laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Church Temporalities (Ireland).—Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 60.]

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath 763

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Taxes on Food and Drink.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 763

Land Disturbances at Barhane—Case of John Padden.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 764

Rents on Colonel Smyth's Estate at Collinstown.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 764

Feb. 26.]

Page

IMPROVEMENT OF CLIFDEN HARBOUR, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Bryce 765

RIVER SHANNON FISHERIES RETURN.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. McKenna 766

RETIREMENT OF MR. McCONKEY, IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. McKenna 766

ACTION OF DUBLIN POLICE AGAINST MR. LEECH.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 767

SUB-LAND COMMISSIONER McELLIYOTT.—Question, Mr. J. C. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 767

COMPULSORY SALE OF IRISH ESTATES.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 768

REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS—CASES OF MARGARET FRASER AND THOMAS KENT AT MITCHELSTOWN.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 768

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENTS IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 768

PROMOTION OF JUNIOR SUPERVISOR IN THE EXCISE OUTDOOR DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 769

ALIEN IMMIGRATION STATISTICS FOR JANUARY.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Lloyd George 769

LOAN FOR ERECTION OF A DUST DESTRUCTOR AT ACTON.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. John Burns 770

POSTAL FACILITIES AT COLLINSTOWN, COUNTY WESTMEATH.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 771

THE LOISHILMAN RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 771

NATIONALIST AND ORANGE DISTURBANCES AT GLASSLOUGH, COUNTY MONAGHAN.—Questions, Mr. O'Hara (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 771

MORTUARY FOR RATHMINES AND RATHGAR DISTRICTS.—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 772

TRIALS OF CHINESE LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 772

NORWICH CAVALRY BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 773

PAYMENT OF ELECTION EXPENSES—SALARIES TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 773

Feb. 26.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

PORT DEFENCES.—Question, Mr. Redsdale (Brighton); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 774

CONGO FREE STATE.—Question, Sir William Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 774

CHINA AND THE TIBETAN TREATY.—Question, Sir Henry Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 775

OLD AGE PENSIONS.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) and Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 775

ALCOHOL FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES.—Questions, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 776

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES.—Question, Mr. Austen Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Asquith 776

EXCHEQUER BONDS.—Question, Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton); Answer, Mr. Asquith 767

JOINT STOCK BANKS AND BANK OF ENGLAND NOTES.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 777

POLITICAL REFUGEES—ALIENS ACT.—Questions, Mr. Keir-Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), and Sir W. Evans-Gordon; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 778

PENTONVILLE PRISON—GOVERNOR'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 779

LAUNDRY WORKERS;—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, W.), and Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 779

LAMBETH HAIRDRESSERS AND EARLY CLOSING.—Question, Mr. S. Collings (Lambeth, Kennington); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 780

THE NEW RUSSIAN TARIFF.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) and Mr. Chiozza-Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 781

THE FLAX INDUSTRY.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid) and Mr. Chiozza-Money; Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 781

FOREIGN SHIPS IN BRITISH PORTS—LIFE SAVING REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 783

COUPLING ACCIDENTS TO RAILWAY SERVANTS.—Questions, Mr. Bell (Derby) and Mr. H. J. Tennant; Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 784

Feb. 26.]

Page

USE OF SHUNTING POLES ON RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 784

FOREIGNERS AND PILOTAGE CERTIFICATES.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 785

FEES UNDER THE TRADE MARKS ACT.—Question, Mr. G. Croydon Marks (Cornwall, Launceston); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 785

THE TELEPHONE COMPANY'S EMPLOYEES—CONDITION OF TRANSFER TO GOVERNMENT SERVICE.—Questions, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton) and Mr. Keir-Hardie; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 786

DRUMLISH POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 787

THE BRADFORD REPORT.—Question, Sir Wm. Evans-Gordon; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 787

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE WAGES.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 787

REDISTRIBUTION.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil) and Mr. Clancy (Dublin Co., N.); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 787

LONDON UNIVERSITY AND THE SCHOOL OF MINES.—Questions, Sir Wm. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) and Sir Philip Magnus (London University); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 789

THE PROPOSED HAMMERSMITH EXHIBITION.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) .. 789

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN THE FIRTH OF FORTH.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 790

LOCAL TAXATION IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 791

EDINBURGH SCHOOL BOARD AND THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 791

SCOTTISH FISHERY BOARDS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 792

GRANARD ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 793

FLAX CULTIVATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 794

IRISH SCHOOL GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 795

IRISH FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 795

DROMAGH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Flynn ; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 796

KERRY COUNTY COUNCIL AND THE IRISH LAND COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 797

IRISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS—COMPULSORY PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 797

BALLYKINLEY FARM, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.) ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 798

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE MITCHELSTOWN UNION.—Question, Mr. William Abraham ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 798

MR. MATTHEW J. BYRNE.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 799

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 800

BELLACOLLA POST OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 800

RULES OF PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) and Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wilts, Chippenham) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 801

TRAFFIC IN THE METROPOLIS.—Question, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 801

COLONIAL REPRESENTATION IN FOREIGN COURTS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 802

FOREIGN OFFICE QUESTIONS.—Question, Earl Percy (Kensington, S.) ; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 802

NEW BILLS.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854," presented by Mr. McCrae ; supported by Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. John Dewar, and Mr. Robert Wallace ; to be read a second time upon Friday, March 23rd, and to be printed. [Bill 48] .. 804

Sale of Coke Bill.—"To amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1889, respecting the Sale of Coke," presented by Mr. Rose ; supported by Mr. Buckmaster, Mr. Beck, and Mr. Montagu ; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 11th, and to be printed. [Bill 49] 804

Wireless Telegraphy Bill.—"To continue the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1904," presented by Mr. Buxton ; supported by Mr. McKenna ; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 50] 805

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill.—"To give the ratepayers a direct Veto on the Liquor Traffic in their respective areas in Scotland," presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett ; supported by Mr. A. W. Black, Mr. Crombie, Mr. John Hope, Mr. M'Callum, Mr. Robert Wallace, and Mr. Eugene Wason ; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 51] 805

Feb. 26.] *Page*

Places of Worship (Sites) Bill.—" To give further facilities for the acquisition of Sites for Places of Worship," presented by Mr. Perks; supported by Mr. McArthur and Mr. Broadhurst; to be read a second time upon Friday, April 6th, and to be printed. [Bill 52] 805

Tuberculosis (Animals) Prevention and Compensation Bill.—" To provide for the payment of compensation to the owners of animals condemned after slaughter and destroyed by order of a magistrate on account of tuberculosis, and to assist in the prevention of tuberculosis," presented by Mr. Field; supported by Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Roche, Mr. Condon, Mr. Rutherford, Sir Carne Rasch, Mr. Jones, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. MacIver; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 6th March, and to be printed. [Bill 53.] 805

CLOSURING THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 805
Mr. Asquith 806

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (KING'S SPEECH) (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Proceedings on the King's Speech (Motion for an Address), if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Orders (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 343; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 3) 806

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [19th February], " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

" *Most Gracious Sovereign*—

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

UNREST IN INDIA AND PARTITION OF BENGAL.

Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 811
Sir H. Cotton (*Nottingham, E.*) 818

Amendment moved—

" At end of the Question to add the words, ' But we humbly beg to represent to Your Majesty that this House regards with concern the widespread dissatisfaction and unrest of India due to the recent policy of the Government, culminating in the partition of Bengal, and is of opinion that such modifications should be made in the form of administration in Bengal as will tend to allay the existing discontent; and we further beg to represent to Your Majesty that the reasonable demands of the Indian people for a larger share in the administration of their affairs should receive the consideration of the Government.' "—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."

Sir J. Jardine (*Roxburghshire*) 830
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 831
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (*Newington, Walworth*) 834
Mr. T. Hart-Davies (*Hackney, N.*) 837
Mr. Smeaton (*Stirlingshire*) 838
The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. John Morley, Montrose Burghs*) .. 842
Earl Percy (*Kensington, S.*) 847

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Sir W. Evans-Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 851
Sir William Bull (*Hammersmith*) 854

Amendment proposed—

" At the end of the Question to add the words, ' But we humbly express our regret that Your Majesty's Speech contains no reference to the exclusion from this country of foreign contract labour during times of trades disputes.' "—(*Sir William Evans-Gordon.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 855
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 857
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 861

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Stanley Wilson (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) 862

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question (19th February), " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

" *Most Gracious Sovereign,—*

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Stanley Wilson 862
Mr. Luke White (*Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose*) 864

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, "But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the serious encroachments of the sea on our coast call for the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government.' "—(*Mr. Stanley Wilson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. H. H. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 866
Mr. G. Baring (*Isle of Wight*) 867
Mr. Beckett (*Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby*) 869
Mr. H. J. Tennant (*Berwickshire*) 870
Sir A. Acland-Hood (*Somersetshire, Wellington*) 871
Mr. H. Beaumont (*Sussex, Eastbourne*) 872
Mr. Summerbell (*Sunderland*) 872
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 873
Mr. Akers-Douglas (*Kent, St. Augustine's*) 875
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 875
Mr. McVeigh (*Donegal, E.*) 876

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 876

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question to add the words, 'But humbly to represent that whilst Your Majesty records with satisfaction the fact the imports and exports of the country show a steady and accelerating increase, there is widespread misery among the labouring classes due to want of employment, and this House regrets that no remedy has been proposed in Your Majesty's gracious Speech to prevent the great want of employment which exists.' "—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. G. H. Roberts (*Norwich*) 883
Mr. John Burns 886
Mr. Courthope (*Sussex, Rye*) 898
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 900

Question put, "To add at the end of the Address, 'But humbly to represent that, whilst Your Majesty records with satisfaction the fact that the imports and exports of the country show a steady and accelerating increase, there is widespread misery among the labouring classes due

to want of employment, and this House regrets that no remedy has been proposed in Your Majesty's gracious Speech to prevent the great want of employment which exists.' "

Question negatived. and Main Question again proposed.

Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 902

Amendment proposed—

" At the end of the Question, to add the words: 'But humbly regret that no mention is made of any arrangement for making the maintenance of public roads a charge on the Imperial Exchequer.' "—(*Colonel Lockwood*).

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 903

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

" *Most Gracious Sovereign,—*

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

SUPPLY.—Resolved, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Ordered, That the several Estimates presented to this House during the present session be referred to the Committee of Supply. 904

WAYS AND MEANS.—Resolved, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.—(*Mr. M'Kenna*) 904

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1899) Amendment Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 904

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The LORD MIDDLETON took the Oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Tables showing the extent in statute acres and the produce of the crops for the year 1905 905

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Report for the year 1904 on the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Colleges of Science and of Art, the Geological Survey and Museum, and on the work of the Solar Physics Committee.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table. 905

PIERS AND HARBOURS (PROVISIONAL ORDERS), SESSION 1906.—Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, and the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, Amendment Act 905

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHS STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1906. No. 136).—The Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1906, dated 1st January, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 905

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.—Scheme for the management of the Crewkerne Grammar School Foundation, in the parish of Crewkerne, in the county of Somerset, founded by John Combe, in or about the year 1499, regulated by a scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts on 21st July, 1876, as altered by schemes of the Charity Commissioners of the 30th November, 1877, and the 23rd February, 1883, and as amended by a scheme made under the said Acts on the 3rd October, 1895. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 17.) 905

THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES—The adjourned debate arising out of a question put by Viscount Milner—namely, " Whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies could give the House any information as to the form of the proposed Constitutions of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State " —was resumed by

Lord Burghclere 906
Earl Roberts 914
Viscount Halifax 917
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 925
Viscount Milner 930
The Marquess of Londonderry 933
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 938
The Earl of Halsbury 946
Lord Stanmore 953
The Marquess of Winchester 962
The Earl of Harrowby 967
Lord Stanley of Alderley 972
Lord Monteagle of Beaulieu 981
The Marquess of Lansdowne 985
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 993

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock a.m., to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Hants (Northern or Basingstoke Division), in the room of the right hon. Arthur Frederick Jeffreys, deceased.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 1003

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case fo the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz. :—Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill ; Derby Gas Bill ; Peterborough Gas Bill ; Southampton Gas Bill ; Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1004

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz. :—Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill ; London Electric Supply Corporation Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1004

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill; to be read a second time upon Monday next 1004

Burry Port Gas and Improvement ; Pontefract Corporation Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 1004

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 1004

Huddersfield Corporation Bill [BY ORDER].—Read a second time, and committed 1004

London County Council (General Powers) Bill [BY ORDER] ; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill [by Order].—Read a second time, and committed 1004

West Middlesex Roads Bill [BY ORDER]—Read a second time, and committed 1004

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.—Petitions in favour ; from Leigh ; and Widnes ; to lie upon the Table 1005

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Report on the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Colleges of Science and of Art, the Geological Survey and Museum, and on the work of the Solar Physics Committee for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1005

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.—Copy presented, of Scheme under the Acts for the Management of the Crewkerne Grammar School Foundation, in the parish of Crewkerne, in the county of Somerset, founded by John Combe in or about the year 1499, regulated by a Scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts on 21st July, 1876, as altered by Schemes of the Charity Commissioners of 30th November, 1877, and 23rd February, 1883, and as amended by a Scheme made under the said Acts on 3rd October, 1895 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1005

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Tables showing the extent in statute acres and the produce of the Crops for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1005

PIERS AND HARBOURS (PROVISIONAL ORDERS).—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, and The General Pier and Harbour Act (1861) Amendment Act, Session 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. (No. 61.) 1005

Notice of Accidents Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatory of the objects of the Notice of Accidents Bill."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

Copy presented, accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 62) 1005

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

MEN EMPLOYED BUILDING "DREADNOUGHT" AND "BRITANNIA."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (King's Lynn); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1006

SALE OF ENGLISH LINE OF NILE STEAMERS TO GERMAN COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1007

DECORATION OF OUTER LOBBY.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1007

EFFECT OF RESTRICTION OF IMPORTATION OF LIVE CATTLE ON PRICES OF BEEF AND MUTTON.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1008

REMOVAL OF H.M.S. "SATELLITE" FROM THE TYNE.—Question, Mr. H. J. Craig (Tynemouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1009

DAY OF REST FOR METROPOLITAN POLICEMEN.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1011

EQUALISATION OF RATES BILL—AREA AFFECTED.—Question, Mr. Thorne; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1011

Feb. 27.] Page

OLD AGE PENSIONS AND INDOOR RELIEF.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1011

INDIAN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS—PLACE OF RESIDENCE AWAITING COMPULSORY RETIREMENT.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley 1012

ARMY CANDIDATES AND IRISH TAILORS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1013

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—POSITION OF MR. PORTER.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1014

SPEECH BY COLONEL DAVIES AT DINNER OF IMPERIAL LIGHT HORSE.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1015

ARMY CLOTHING CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Nicholls (Northamptonshire); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1016

SITTINGS OF FOREIGN COLONIAL LEGISLATURES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1016

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

DISCHARGES OF GOVERNMENT WORKMEN.—Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1017

GENERAL IAN HAMILTON'S BOOK.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 1017

SOLDIERS IN CIVILIAN PRISONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1018

AUSTRALIAN COLONIES AND IRISH HOME RULE.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare E.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1018

KAFFIR LABOUR AT TRANSVAAL MINES.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) and Mr. Belloc, Salford, S.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1018

CAPE COLONY FRANCHISE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1019

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1020

TRANSVAAL ELECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1020

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1020

NATAL DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1021

Feb. 27.] *Page*

Orange River Colony Franchise.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1021

Transvaal and Orange River Colony Population.—Questions, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answers, Mr. Churchill 1021

Gold Output in the Transvaal.—Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1021

Northern Nigeria Disturbances.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1022

Physical Deterioration Committee's Report.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1023

Licensing Act—Compensation Returns.—Question, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1023

Examination for Factory Inspectors.—Questions, Mr. Chiozza-Money (Paddington, N.) and Mr. J. R. Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1024

West Yorkshire Police Passive Resisters' Goods.—Question, Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1025

Alien Immigration Boards and the Press.—Question, Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1025

Maintenance of Parents—Imprisonment for Non-Payment.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1026

Administration of the Housing Acts.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1027

British Insurance Companies—Suggested Official Audit.—Questions, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1027

Merchant Shipping Bill.—Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1028

Cleator Moor Postal Service.—Question, Mr. Fullerton (Cumberland, Egremont); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1028

Irish National Schools—Building Plans.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1028

Epizootic Abortion in Cattle.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Agriculture (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) 1028

Cahersavane—Clooghvoola Roads.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 1029

Feb. 27.] *Page*

CLARE LAND COMMISSION.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1029

IRISH POLICE AND THE DUNGANNON CLUB, CARRICKMORE.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1030

THOMPSON ESTATE, NORTH LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1030

DR. KENNY'S ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1031

PROPOSED MONUMENT TO ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS AT ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1031

GORT OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1032

ATTACKS ON CATHOLICS AT DESERTMARTIN, DERRY.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1032

BALLINACARRA SEWER WORKS.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1033

IRISH LEGISLATION.—Questions, Mr. Finch (Rutland); Answers, Mr. Bryce .. 1033

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Lord Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1034

CHURCH DISCIPLINE COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.—Question, Mr. Harmood Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1034

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CANALS.—Question, Mr. Clements Edwards (Denbigh Districts); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1034

PROCEDURE RULES.—Questions, Mr. Stanley Wilson and Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, Mr. Asquith 1034

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, for the county of Wilts (Western of Westbury Division) 1036

NEW BILLS.

Police (Superannuation) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Superannuation of Constables," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 54.] 1036

Notice of Accidents Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Returns and Notifications of Accidents in mines, quarries, factories, and workshops, and under The Notice of Accidents Act, 1894," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 55.] 1036

Local Government (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill.—"To make further provision for Local Government in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Major Anstruther-Gray; supported by Mr. Younger, Mr. Cochrane, Sir John Tuke, and Mr. Eugene Wason; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 7th March, and to be printed. [Bill 56.] 1036

Borough Court (Dublin) Bill.—"To better define the jurisdiction and improve the procedure of the Borough Court of the city of Dublin; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Clancy; supported by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, and Mr. Waldron; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 57.] .. 1035

Agricultural Holdings Bill.—"To amend the Agricultural Holdings Acts, and to make other provisions as to the Tenure of Agricultural Land," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Mr. Price, Mr. Reckitt, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Mackarness, and Mr. Luttrell; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 58.] 1035

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT, upon the Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, took the Chair of the Committee as Chairman of Ways and Means.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

CLASS II.

1. £130 (Supplementary), Friendly Societies Registry.

Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) 1036
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouth, N.*) 1036

Motion put, and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

2. £36,000 (Supplementary), Temporary Commissions.

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1037
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 1037
Mr. Clancy (*Dublin County, N.*) 1038
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1039
Mr. Morton 1039
Mr. Lief Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 1040
Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) 1040
Mr. Dalziel 1040
Mr. Vivian (*Birkenhead*) 1041
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 1042
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1044
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 1044
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 1045
Mr. Clancy (*Dublin County, N.*) 1046
Mr. Wm. Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 1046
Mr. John Burns 1046
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 1048
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 1049
Sir Henry Kimber (*Wandsworth*) 1050
Mr. T. W. Russell 1050

Feb. 27.] *Page*

Vote agreed to.

3. £10,000 Vote, Milan Exhibition, 1906.

Mr. Dalziel 1054
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1055
Mr. Paul (*Northampton*) 1056
Mr. McKenna 1056
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1058
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 1061
Mr. Morton 1062
Mr. Paul 1062
Mr. Dalziel 1062
Mr. Charles Devlin (*Galway*) 1063
Mr. McKenna 1063
Mr. R. Duncan (*Lanarkshire, Govan*) 1064
Mr. Bottomley (*Hackney, S.*) 1064
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 1065

Vote agreed.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

4. £9,000 (Supplementary) Customs.

CLASS III.

5. £1,600 (Supplementary) Irish Land Commission.

Mr. Walter Long 1065
Mr. Clancy 1066
Mr. T. W. Russell 1066
Mr. McKenna 1066
Mr. Morton 1068
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.*) 1068

Vote agreed to.

CLASS V.

6. £500 (Supplementary) Diplomatic and Consular Services.

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 1068
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick*) 1069

Vote agreed to.

7. £54,683, Newfoundland Fisheries Indemnity.

Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 1069
Sir Edward Grey 1072
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1072
Mr. Morton 1074

Vote agreed to.

8. £8,567, Samoa Arbitration Claims.

Sir Edward Grey 1075

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Ordered, that a Select Committee be appointed to control the arrangements for the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the Department of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of seventeen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of,—Mr. Barnard, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Dalziel, Viscount Helmsley, Mr. John Deans Hope, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Lea, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. McKillop, Mr. Power, Mr. William Redmond, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Walrond, and Mr. Osmond Williams.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*) 1076

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

THE LAW OF TRUCK.

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1076
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 1083

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary to put an end to fines and deductions from wages."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Mr. Bell (*Derby*) 1084
Mr. J. Havelock Wilson (*Middlesbrough*) 1087
Mr. Fenwick (*Northumberland, Wansbeck*) 1087
Mr. Seddon (*Lancashire, Newton*) 1089
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 1091
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1093
Sir Edward Clarke (*City of London*) 1101
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 1103

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words 'other than such as may be specially legalised by Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 1104
Mr. J. Johnson (*Gateshead*) 1105
Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*) 1106
Mr. H. J. Tennant (*Berwickshire*) 1107
Mr. R. Duncan (*Lanarkshire, Govan*) 1108

Question, " That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary to put an end to fines and deduction from wages other than such as may be specially legalised by Parliament.

Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Schwann (*Manchester, N.*) 1109

Motion made and Question proposed—" That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1110
Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 1110
Mr. John Burns 1111

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

House of Commons.

By virtue of an Act passed in the twenty-fourth year of the regin of His late Majesty King George the Third, intituled, " An Act to repeal so much of two Acts made in the tenth and fifteenth years of the reign of His present Majesty, as authorises the Speaker of the House of Commons to issue His Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown for making out Writs for the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, in the manner therein mentioned, and for substituting other provisions for the like purpose."

I do hereby nominate, appoint, and authorise—The right hon. George Finch, the right hon. Thomas Burt, the right hon. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Sir James Kitson, and Sir John Brunner, being Members of the House of Commons, or any one or more of them, to execute all and singular the powers given to the Speaker of the House of Commons for the time being, for issuing Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown, in the cases as in the said Act specified.

Given under my hand and seal, this twenty-seventh day of February, in year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and six. (James W. Lowther, *Speaker.*) 1112

(L.S.)

27 February, 1906.

In pursuance of Standing Order No. 1, "Sittings of the House."

I hereby nominate—The right hon. Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Edward Blake, Sir William Holland, Mr. Charles Fenwick, and Mr. Alfred Hutton, to act during this session as temporary Chairmen of Committees when requested by the Chairman of Ways and Means. (James W. Lowther, *Speaker.*) 1112

27 February 1906.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 28th FEBRUARY, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.]

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; London Outer Circle Railway Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill, read a second time, and committed 1113

PETITIONS.

Juvenile Smoking.—Petition from North Durham, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1113

Land Values (Assessment and Rating Bill).—Petitions in favour; from Bethnal Green, Eccles, and Forres; to lie upon the Table 1113

Sugar Tax.—Petition from Sheffield, for repeal; to lie upon the Table .. 1113

British Museum.—Petition of the Trustees of the British Museum (King's Recommendation signified), for grant-in-aid; referred to the Committee of Supply 1113

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and Amending Acts.—Paper [presented 27th February] to be printed. [No. 63.] 1113

Post Office (Money Orders).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Inland) Regulations, 1905, dated 12th October, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1113

Post Office (Money Orders).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 6) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th September, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1113

National Debt (Savings Banks and Friendly Societies).—Annual Account presented, for the period ended 20th November, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 64.] 1114

British South Africa Company.—Copy presented, of Financial Statements of the British South Africa Company for 1902–3, 1903–4, 1904–5, and Estimates for 1903–4, 1904–5, and 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1114

Feb. 28.] Page

BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.—Copy presented, of Report to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage, by Sir Alexander R. Binnie [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1114

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS 1906–7 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).—Estimate presented, showing the several services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. (No. 65.] .. 1114

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Private Bills, Copy of Rules for the Practice and Procedure of the Referees on Private Bills [in pursuance of Standing Order 88]; to be printed. [No. 66.] .. 1114

BRITISH MUSEUM.—Account ordered, " of the Income and Expenditure of the British Museum (Special Trust Funds) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1906; and return of the number of persons admitted to visit the Museum and the British Museum (Natural History) in each year from 1900 to 1905, both years inclusive; together with a statement of the progress made in the arrangement and description of the collections; and an account of objects added to them in the year 1905."—(*Mr. Rothschild.*) .. 1114

RAILWAY, ETC., BILLS.—Copy ordered, " of Report by Board of Trade upon all the Bills and Provisional Orders of Session, 1906 relating to railways, canals, tramways, harbours, and tidal waters, and the supply of electricity, gas, and water."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*) 1114

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (MONTHLY STATEMENTS).—Copy ordered, " of statements for each month of the year 1906 of the number of paupers relieved in England and Wales (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 40, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Runciman.*) 1114

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT AMENDMENTS TO TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1115

VETO OF HOME GOVERNMENT OF LEGISLATION OF SELF-GOVERNING COLONIES.—Question, Colonel Legge; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1115

LORD MILNER AND CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHINESE LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1115

CHINESE LABOURERS—PUNISHMENT OF THE CANGUE.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1116

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS FOR ORDINANCE WORK.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1116

TRANSVAAL GARRISON.—Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1117

ROYAL IRISH RIFLES MILITIA TRAINING.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1117

EFFECT OF NEW GERMAN TARIFF ON BRITISH GOODS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1117

Feb. 28.] *Page*

EFFECT OF NEW RUSSIAN TARIFF ON BRITISH MEDICINES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1118

SALE OF GOODS CONFISCATED BY CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1118

REGULATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1119

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT GRANT (IRELAND) FUND.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1120

SUGGESTED INTRODUCTION OF A SEED SUPPLY BILL.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1120

IMPROVEMENT OF KAFFIR COMPOUNDS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1121

CONDITION OF KAFFIRS EMPLOYED AT KIMBERLEY DIAMOND MINES.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1211

ABRIDGED PROCEDURE FOR PARTLY CONSIDERED BILLS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1121

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1122

NAVAL AND MARINE OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1123

THE REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Brotherton (Wakefield; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1123

VOLUNTEER FORCES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) and Mr. Arnold-Foster (Croydon); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1123

COLONEL DAVIES AND THE PRIME MINISTER.—Questions, Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1124

ORANGE RIVER COLONY CONSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Brotherton; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1125

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square) and Mr. Courthope; Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1125

INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Hills (Durham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1126

FACTORY INSPECTION AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.), and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. 1127

Feb. 28.] *Page*

WOMEN FACTORY INSPECTORS.—Questions, Mr. King (Cheshire, Knutsford), Mr. H. J. Tennant, and Mr. Sloan; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1127

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1128

POLICE AND PUBLIC—CASE OF MR. HAROLD PRICE.—Question, Mr. Radford (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1128

MATCH BOX INDUSTRY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1129

MEALS TO SCHOOL CHILDREN—PARENTS' LIABILITY.—Question, Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1129

MEDICAL AND DENTAL ACTS.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1129

WALES AND THE PROPOSED CANAL COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1130

EMIGRATION RETURNS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1130

PUBLIC WORKS—HOUSE ACCOMMODATION FOR WORKMEN.—Question, Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1130

WEIGHT OF POST PARCELS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 1131

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896.—Question, Lord Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1131

BRADFORD SCHOOL-CHILDREN'S MEALS.—Question, Mr. Jowett; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1132

ENGLISH HOP CROP RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1132

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND THE HIGHLAND SOCIETY SHOW.—Question, Lord Dalmeny (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey .. 1133

GOVERNMENT EDUCATION POLICY.—Question, Mr. Finch (Rutland); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 1133

EDUCATION RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Wyndham (Dover); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1133

LAND RENT DESPARITIES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 1134

IRISH JUDICIAL RENTS.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1135

IRISH FISHERIES—CLOSE SEASON.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1136

Feb. 28.] *Page*

Lord Dunraven's Limerick Estates.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1137

Evicted Tenants on the Dunraven Estates.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1137

Second Term Rents in Queen's County.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1138

Sligo Council Printing Contract.—Questions, Mr. Liddell (Down, W.), Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh), Mr. Farrell (Longford, N.) and Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1139

Compensation Claim at Limerick Quarter Sessions.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1140

Blake Estate, County Galway.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1140

Drogheda Compensation Claim.—Questions, Captain Craig and Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1141

Athenry Outrage.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1141

South Tyrone Election.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1142

Irish Rent Appeals.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1144

Wexford Jury and Voters' List.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1145

Newman Estate, Mallow, County Cork.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1145

Tobacco Growing in Ireland.—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1146

Football in Phœnix Park, Dublin.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1146

Basis Wines.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 1147

Old Age Pensions.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1147

Coolie Labour in British Guiana.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1148

Franchise Reform.—Question, Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1148

Prevention of Chinese Immigration into the United Kingdom.—Questions, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) and Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, Mr. Asquith 1149

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POSTPONEMENT OF THE FISCAL DEBATE.—Questions, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Asquith. 1149

NEW BILLS.

Pharmacy Bill.—" To provide for the further regulation of the sale of poisons and the compounding of medical prescriptions, and to amend the Pharmacy Acts, 1852 and 1868," presented by Mr. Winfrey; supported by Mr. Idris Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Mr. James Gibb, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Gulland, and Mr. O Malley; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 14th March, and to be printed. [Bill 59.] 1151

Intoxicating Liquors Local Veto (Ireland) Bill.—" To enable the local government electors of any locality to veto the issue of licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland," presented by Mr. William Redmond; supported by Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Glendinning, Mr. Boland, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Smyth, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, and Sir Thomas Esmonde; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 60.] 1151

Licensed Premises (Election Days) Closing Bill.—" To secure the closing of Licensed Premises on certain Election Days," presented by Mr. Charles Roberts; supported by Mr. Billson, Colonel Herbert, Mr. T. W. Russell Major Renton, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Whitwell Wilson, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, 18th May and to be printed. [Bill 61.] 1152

Labour Pensions Bill.—" To provide pensions for the aged and deserving poor without disfranchisement," presented by Mr. Archibald Grove; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 14th March, and to be printed. [Bill 62.] 1152

Sale of Whisky Bill—" To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Whisky and to provide for the marking of casks and other vessels containing Whisky," presented by Mr. Archibald Williamson; supported by Mr Sutherland, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Billson, and Mr. Harmood-Banner to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 21st March, and to be printed. [Bill 63.] 1152

Summary Jurisdiction (Children) Bill.—" To amend the law relating to the Trial and Detention of Children," presented by Mr. John Tennant, supported by Lord Edmund Talbot, Sir Howard Vincent, Sir George Kekewich, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Allen, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. Spicer, and Mr. J. R. Macdonald, to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 64.] 1152

REFORM OF PROCEDURE—APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.*) 1152

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Question of Procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the amendment of the existing Rules and upon any new Rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Feb. 28.]

Page
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1155
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1156
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1158
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 1158
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1363
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 1165
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1165
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 1167
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 1170
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 1175
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 1178
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 1181
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 1183
Sir John Kennaway (Devon, Honiton) 1184
Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.) 1185
Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) 1186
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1188
The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.) 1189
Mr. Burdett Coutts (Westminster) 1194
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central 1195
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1196

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the question of Procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the Amendment of the existing Rules and upon any new Rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

[MR. CALDWELL, on the Motion of Sir Henry Fowler, took the Chair as Deputy-Chairman.]

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow

SUPPLY [27TH FEBRUARY] REPORT.—Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

CLASS II

1. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £130, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of Registry of Friendly Societies."

CLASS VII.

2. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £36,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and other Expenses of Temporary Commissions, Committees, and Special Inquiries."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the British Commission for the Milan International Exhibition, 1906."

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

4. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £9,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department."

CLASS III.

5. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,600, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

CLASS V.

6. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £500, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Expenses in connection with His Majesty's Missions Abroad."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £54,683, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for paying to the French Government the Compensation awarded to French Fishermen on the Treaty Shore of Newfoundland."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,567, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Settlement of the Samoa Arbitration Claims."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1200
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 1200
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 1201

Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1202
Mr. Wilkie (Dundee) 1202
Mr. John Burns 1203

Question put, and agreed to.

Third Resolution.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Paul (Northampton) 1205
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 1207
Mr. Morton 1208
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1208

Question put, and agreed to.

Fourth Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 1209
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 1210
Mr. Dalziel 1210

Question put and agreed to.

Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eights Resolutions agreed to.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

The Postmaster-General (*Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) .. 1210

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1211

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months.' "—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1211

Question put, and negatived.

Main Question put, and agreed to

Bill read a Second time, and committed for To-morrow.

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING

SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE RACES.

Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) 1212
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 1214

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That in any settlement of South African affairs, this House desires a recognition of Imperial responsibility for the protection of all races excluded from equal political rights, the safeguarding of all immigrants against servile conditions of labour and the guarantee to the native populations of at least their existing status, with the unbroken possession of their liberties in Basutoland Bechuanaland, and other tribal countries and reservations."—(*Mr. Byles.*)

Mr. J. M. Robertson (*Northumberland, Tyneside*) 1216
Mr. Wedgwood (*Newcastle-under-Lyme*) 1224
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 1226
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.*) 1231
Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 1244

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That in any settlement of South African affairs, this House desires a recognition of Imperial responsibility for the protection of all races excluded from equal political rights, the safeguarding of all immigrants against servile conditions of labour, and the guarantee to the native populations of at least their existing status, with the unbroken possession of their liberties in Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and other ribal countries and reservations.—(*Mr. Byles.*)

WINES IMPORTED.—Return ordered, "showing the quantity of wines, at the various degrees of strength, which were imported into the United Kingdom in 1905, from Spain, Portugal, Madeira, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, and other countries (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 105, of Session 1905)."—(*Sir Edward Clarke.*)

NAVY (OFFICERS).

Return ordered, "of (1) all Engineer Officers (Active List) of the rank of Engineer-Lieutenant and above serving on shore in the United Kingdom on he 1st day of January, 1906, under the following heads :—

Rank.	Name of last sea-going ship served in, exclusive of manœuvres.	Nature of ship's boilers, water tube or cylindrical.	Date of leaving ship for shore service.	Interval since last service afloat.

(2) All Executive Officers (Active List) now serving at the Admiralty, under the following headings:—

Rank.	Name of last sea-going ship served in, exclusive of manœuvres.	Date of leaving ship for shore service.	Interval since last service afloat.

(3) Average intervals since last service afloat for all Engineer Officers and for all Executive Officers enumerated above."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*) .. 1248

Adjourned at one minute before Twelve o'clock

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 1st MARCH, 1906

Viscount Ferrard.—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Algernon William John Clotworthy Skeffington Viscount Ferrard to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1249

Several Lords took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: West Cumberland Electric Tramways.

And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with: Mid Derbyshire Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1249

Wallis' Divorce Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to dissolve the marriage of Elizabeth Caroline Wallis with Henry Aubrey Beaumont Wallis, commonly called Aubrey Wallis, her present husband, and to enable her to marry again, and for other purposes. Presented (on petition), and a copy of the proceedings in and of the decree of divorce of the King's Bench, Matrimonial Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland delivered (on oath). Bill read 1^a; and to be read 2^a on Monday, the 12th instant 1249

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

British South Africa Company.—Financial Statements for 1902–1903, 1903–1904, and 1904–1905, and Estimates for 1903–1904, 1904–1905 and 1905–1906 (in continuation of [Cd. 1682] July 1903) 1249

Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage.—Report of Sir Alexander R. Binnie. Presented (by command) and ordered to lie on the Table 1250

Mar. 1.] *Page*

POST OFFICE STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS. 1905.

No. 1089. The Postal Order (Inland) Regulations 1905 dated 12th October, 1905.

No. 1191. The Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment No. 6) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th September, 1905 1230

NATIONAL DEBT (SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES).

Account of the gross amount of all sums received and paid by the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt on account of banks for savings and friendly societies in Great Britain and Ireland, from their commencement at 6th August, 1817, to 20th November, 1905, inclusive.

Account of the several transactions which have taken place, during the year ended 20th November, 1905, in the investment of all moneys which came into the hands of the Commissioners for the Reductions of the National Debt for savings banks and friendly societies.

Account showing the aggregate amount of the liabilities of the Government to the trustees of savings banks and friendly societies respectively on 20th November 1905, etc.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1250

NEW BILLS.

Public Health Acts (Amendment Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Public Health Acts was presented by the Lord Hylton; read 1^{a}; and to be printed. (No. 18.) 1250

Limited Partnerships Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to establish limited partnerships was presented by the Lord Avebury; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Thursday; the 15th instant. (No. 19.) 1251

Prize Courts Bill [H.L.].—A Bill for amending the law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in prize courts; (No. 20) and 1251

Naval Prize Bill [H.L.].

A Bill to consolidate, with Amendments, the enactments relating to naval prize of war. (No. 21.)

Were presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1^{a}; and to be printed .. 1251

Marine Insurance Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Halsbury 1251

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

Earl Russell 1252
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1253

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING].—Order of th day for the Second Reading read

The Earl of Halsbury 1253

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2."—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

Lord Avebury 1254
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1254
The Lord Chancellor 1256

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

FOREIGN SEAMEN IN BRITISH SHIPS.

Earl de la Warr 1256
The Earl of Granard 1257
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 1257

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills That, in the case of the following Bills referred on the First Reading thereof Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—London Southern Tramways Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1258

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS]. (STANDING ORDERS COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have been complied with, viz.:—West Cumberland Electric Tramways Bill [Lords] 1258

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Mid-Derbyshire Railway Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report to be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 1259

Mar. 1.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

Land Values (Assessment and Rating) Bill.—Petition from Finsbury, in avour, to lie upon the Table 1259

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Navy (Dockyard Expense accounts, 1904–5).—Annual Accounts presented, for 1904–5, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Repor of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 66] 1259

Navy (Victualling Yard Manufacturing Accounts, 1904–5).—Annua Accounts presented, of the Cost of Manufacturing Provisions, Victuallin Stores, etc., at the Home Victualling Yards and Malta Yard for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 67] 1259

Army (Ordnance Factories).—Annual Accounts presented, for the year 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 68] 1259

Pauperism (England and Wales) (Monthly Statements).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon he Table, and to be printed. [No. 69] 1259

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Hammersmith Postal Arrangements.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1260

Postage Rate for Periodical Literature.—Questions, Mr. Norman; Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1260

London Suburban Telephone Service.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1261

Central Telephone Exchange.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1261

Irish Arterial Drainage.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1262

Trinity College, Dublin Estates.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1262

Alleged Outrage at Loughrea.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1263

Athenry Outrage.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1263

Public Appointment at Cahiriciveen.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1264

Kiltimagh Dispensary Doctor.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1264

Mar. 1.] Page

HUNTING DIFFICULTIES IN COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1265

ALLEGED OUTRAGE AT ARDRAHAN.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1266

IRISH LAND—FUTURE TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1266

HORSE DISEASE AT WATERFORD—CLAIMS AGAINST THE WAR OFFICE.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1267

THE O'HARA-FRENCH ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1267

LONGFORD COURT HOUSES.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1268

LONGFORD EVICTED TENANT—CASE OF MARY MORAN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1268

GOVERNMENT GRANT FOR MULLINGAR LUNATIC ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1269

JESSOP ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1269

MOUNTMELLICK ASSAULT CASE.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1270

ARMAGHEUR GRAZING FARM, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1271

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT AND SOUTH DUBLIN ELECTION.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1271

PROPOSED BUREAU OF FORESTRY IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1271

AGRICULTURAL TRANSPORT IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1272

WATERFORD EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1272

STEAM TRAWLING IN BANTRY BAY.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1273

LAND PURCHASE BY THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD IN COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1273

BUILDING PLANS FOR IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1274

COUNTY MONAGHAN AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. O'Hara (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1274

Mar. 1.]

Page

AFFLICTED CHILDREN BILL—LOCAL OPINIONS.—Question, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1275

EVICTED TENANTS' RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Walter Long; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1275

IRISH ARTERIAL DRAINAGE INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Walter Long; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1276

ATTACK ON ORANGEMEN AT DONEMARA.—Question, Mr. Liddell (Down, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1276

KERRY EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1277

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY RECRUITS.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1277

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1278

WITWATERSRAND DEEP MINE.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1279

DEMERARA LABOUR TROUBLES.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1279

PUNITIVE EXPEDITIONS IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1280

ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1281

COOLIE LABOUR REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1281

THE TRANSVAAL AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.—Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1281

LABOUR RECRUITMENT IN BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1282

LORD SELBORNE'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1282

SOUTH AFRICAN COAL DUTIES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1283

WHITE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Fiennes (Oxfordshire, Banbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1283

IMPORTATION OF COOLIES NOT TO BE STOPPED.—Question, Mr. Fullerton (Cumberland, Egremont); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1283

EFFECTS OF CHINESE REPATRIATION.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1284

WHITE LABOUR IN TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Edward Dunn (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1284

Mar. 1.]

Page

LORD SELBORNE'S DESPATCH OF JANUARY 6TH.—Question, Mr. Edward Dunn; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1284

GENERAL BOTHA'S CLAIM.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1285

ISSUE OF COOLIE LABOUR IMPORT LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Walsh (Lanarkshire, Ince); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1285

DISCHARGED ARSENAL AND FACTORY WORKERS.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1286

GUN FIRING AT CAWSAND BAY.—Question, Mr. Dobson (Plymouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1286

ARMY PROMOTIONS.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1287

WATERFORD HORSE EPIDEMIC.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1287

IMPERIAL TROOPS IN NATAL.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1288

TRAINING OF MILITIA BATTALIONS.—Questions, Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University), Mr. James Mason (Windsor), and Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1288

WAR OFFICE LAND PURCHASE IN ESSEX.—Question, Mr. A. L. Lever (Essex, Harwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1290

BRITISH TRADE IN MANCHURIA.—Question, Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1291

BECK COMMISSION BILL.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Sir Lawson Walton 1291

DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.—Question, Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1292

BEET SUGAR PRICES.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1293

ALIEN PILOTS ON BRITISH SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Gibbs (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1293

PENDING POSTAL INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1293

DUNGARVEN AND LISMON MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1294

ALIENS REJECTED AT BRITISH PORTS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1295

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1295

Mar. 1.] *Page*

SACCHARINE SMUGGLING.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1295

INDIAN FINANCE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1296

LAND GRANTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir Clement Hill (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1297

AFRICAN GAME LICENCES.—Question, Sir Clement Hill; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1297

REGIMENTAL MARCHES THROUGH AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1298

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan, Kinross); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1298

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ADMIRALTY POLICY AND THE ENGINEERS AND ARTIFICERS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1299

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1299

DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.—Question, Mr. Jenkins (Chatham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1300

KEYHAM HARBOUR WORKS.—Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) and Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. George Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 1300

DIRECTORSHIP OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN BENGAL.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton (Nottinghamshire, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. John Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1301

THE PARTITION OF BENGAL.—Questions, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth); Answers, Mr. John Morley 1302

INTERNATIONAL SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Berwick) 1303

MACEDONIAN REFORM.—Question, Mr. Gooch (Bath); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1303

CHINA AND THE TIBETAN CONVENTION.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1304

CONSULAR COMMERCIAL REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1304

METROPOLITAN POLICE AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1305

Page

TRADES DISPUTES BILL.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1305

EXAMINATIONS FOR FACTORY INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1305

FOREIGN PILOTS ON BRITISH SHIPS.—Questions, Mr. Beckett (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitley) and Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1306

BRITISH FACTORIES ABROAD.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1307

FOREIGN TARIFFS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent and Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 1309

STEERAGE ACCOMMODATION ON FOREIGN STEAMERS.—Question, Sir William Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 1309

SHIPPING STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Cairns (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1309

FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.—Questions, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars), Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, E.), Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.) and Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1310

POSTAGE ON LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND.—Question, Lord Valentine (Oxford); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1311

MEMBERS' POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1312

WESTERN DISTRICT OFFICE—ADULT MESSENGERS' OVERTIME PAY.—Question, Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1312

MANCHESTER POSTMEN'S PAY.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1313

LABOUR BUREAUX.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1313

AGED POOR.—Question, Mr. Barnes; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1313

IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN CATTLE.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1314

VACANT CROWN LANDS.—Question, Mr. Harmood Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1315

CUSTOMS STATISTICAL OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. McKinnon 1315

QUEEN'S COLLEGES IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1316

Mar. 1.] *Page*

County Court Printing and Stationery Contracts.—Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1317

Training of Teachers.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1317

Examinations in Welsh Subjects.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1318

Kensington Avenue School, East Ham.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1319

Commercial Corruption.—Question, Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Lawson Walton, Leeds, S.) 1319

Church Rates in Scotland.—Questions, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) and Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfar) 1319

Scotland and the Housing of the Working Classes.—Question, Mr. Barnes; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1320

Sligo Conspiracy Trials.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.) and Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) 1321

Private Bags at the Wexford Post Office.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1322

Keadue (Roscommon) Telegraph Office.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1323

Unemployed White Labour in the Transvaal.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1323

Tea Duty and the Budget.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1323

The Royal Commission on Canals.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer Mr. Asquith 1324

Business of the House.—Question, Mr. Austen Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1324

Questions in the House.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1324

New Member Sworn.—James Murray, esquire, for the County of Aberdeen (Eastern Division) 1325

Selection (Unopposed Bill Committees) (Panel).

Sir Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had selected the following seven Members to be the Panel to serve on Unopposed Bill Committees under Standing Order No. 109; Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Beale, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. J. W. Hills, and Mr. Mooney.

Report to lie upon the Table 1325

Page

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).—Order for Committee read.

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee*) .. 1325

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. Arthur Lee (*Hampshire, Fareham*) .. 1335
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) .. 1342
Mr. Bellairs (*Lynn Regis*) .. 1344
Captain Hervey (*Bury St. Edmunds*) .. 1352
Mr. J. Williams Benn (*Devonport*) .. 1358
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) .. 1360
Mr. Jenkins (*Chatham*) .. 1365
Mr. Summerbell (*Sunderland*) .. 1370

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word, 'That' to the end of the Question in order to add the words 'This House is of opinion that the Government, as model employers, should pay the workers in the dockyards not less than the standard trade union rate of wages paid for similar work in the district; further, in order to maintain amicable relations between the heads of the respective departments and the employees, the right of negotiation through the accredited representatives of the workmen should be at once recognised.'"—(*Mr. Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Napier (*Faversham*) .. 1371
Sir J. Baker (*Portsmouth* .. 1372
Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 1373
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) .. 1375

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 1376
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton*) 1377

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES 1906–7.

1. 129,000 Officers, Seamen, and Boys.

2. £6,810,700, Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines.

Mar. 1.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,954,500, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Expense of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants in Aid, and other Charges connected therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1378

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Mr. Edmund Robertson 1379
Mr. Arthur Lee 1379
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1380

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Arthur Lee 1381
Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 1382
Mr. Edmund Robertson 1383

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out 'Parliament otherwise determine' and insert 'Thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and twelve.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," and negatived.

Question put, "That these words be there inserted," and agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended to be considered to-morrow 1383

PUBLIC PETITIONS.—Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed:—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it:—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of,—Mr. E. Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Colonel Legge, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. J. W. Philips, Mr. Charles Shaw, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. Wills, and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*) 1384

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Joseph Albert Pease.*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at Twenty-three Minutes after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

KING'S SPEECH (ANSWER TO ADDRESS).—The Comptroller of the House reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address, as followeth—

"I have received with great satisfaction the loyal and dutiful expression of your thanks for the Speech with which I have opened the present Session of Parliament" 1385

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDERS 62 AND 63 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Orders Nos. 62 and 63 have been complied with, viz.:—Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1385

Mar. 2.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.—Petitions in favour, from Aberystwyth and Batley, to lie upon the Table 1385

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.—Copy presented, of Estimates for Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March, 1907, together with a Copy of the Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury relating thereto [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 71.] 1385

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (BRITISH EMPIRE).—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the British Empire in each year from 1890–1904. Second Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1386

RAILWAYS, ETC., BILLS.—Return presented, relative there to [ordered 28th February; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 72.] 1386

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland with respect to the Term of Office of a Visiting Committee, and the holding of the first meeting of a Visiting Committee [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1386

BANKRUPTCY COURTS (IRELAND).—Annual Returns presented, of the Official Assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland and the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1386

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IRISH EDUCATION—RULE 127 (B).—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1386

POST OFFICE FACILITIES AT DOCKHEAD, ROTHERHITHE.—Question, Mr. Carr-Gomm (Southwark, Rotherhithe); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1387

POOR LAW MEDICAL OFFICER.—Question, Mr. Pollard (Lancashire, Eccles); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1387

COMPULSORY HIRING ORDERS ISSUED BY COUNTY COUNCILS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1388

OPINIONS ON INDIAN ARMY ADMINISTRATION.—Question Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe); Answer Mr. J. Morley 1388

REPORT OF IRISH POOR LAW COMMISSION.—Question Mr. Barrie (Londonderry N.); Answer Mr. Bryce 1388

EXAMINATION PAPERS OF IRISH PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS.—Question Mr. Conor O'Kelly; Answer Mr. Bryce 1389

TRANSFERS OF IRISH DISTRICTS POLICE INSPECTORS.—Questions Mr. Conor O'Kelly; Answer Mr. Bryce 1389

SUGGESTED GRANT TO JOHN NORRIS OF CROSSREA, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1390

Meals for School Children—Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1390

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. W. T. Wilson.*)

Mr. Paul (Northampton) 1393
Mr Arthur Henderson (Durham Barnard Castle) 1394
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen University) 1399
Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras W.) 1404
Mr. Jowett (Bradford W.) 1409
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1412
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell N.) 1420
Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street) 1426
Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) 1428
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1431
Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) 1435
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1436
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 1440
Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck) 1443
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 1444

Question put and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1446

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words, 'the Standing Committee on Law, &c.,' and insert the words, 'a Select Committee.'"—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Keir-Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1447
Mr. Fenwick 1447
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 1448

Question put, and negatived. Words inserted.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Select Committee.

Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill:—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1448

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 1450
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 1452

Amendment proposed—

> " To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.' "—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Question proposed, " That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Keir Hardie 1453

And, it being half-past Five of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned:

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

RAILWAY TICKETS.—Bill to prevent a time limit being set upon the use of Passenger Tickets, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Morton, Mr. Rowlands, Mr. Ernest Lamb, Mr. Weir, Mr. John Hope, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and Sir Howard Vincent.

Railway Tickets Bill.—" To prevent a time limit being set upon the use of Passenger Tickets," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 65] 1454

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (REGISTRATION).—Bill to amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters ; and for other purposes relating to elections, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cremer, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Bell, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. John Ward, Mr. Maddison, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

Parliamentary Voters (Registration Bill).—" To amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters ; and for other purposes relating to elections," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 66] .. 1454

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOLUME CLII

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SIXTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 13*th February*, 1906.

PARLIAMENT.

Opened by Commission; and the Commons (who were sent for) being at the Bar, were directed to proceed to the choice of a Speaker, and to present such Person whom they should so choose here To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock, for His Majesty's Royal Approbation.

SAT FIRST.

Several Lords took the oath.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*) acquainted the House that His Majesty had been pleased to create the Right Hon. Sir Robert Threshie Reid, G.C.M.G., Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, a Peer of this Realm, by the title of Baron Loveburn of Dumfries, in the county of Dumfries, and his Lordship, having retired to robe, was introduced in the usual manner.

CERTIFICATE OF THE ELECTION OF SIXTEEN REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.

Delivered, and read.

ROLL OF THE LORDS.

Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of the United Kingdom. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

SAT FIRST.

Several Lords took the oath.

Cecil George Savile Baron Hawkesbury, Lord Steward of His Majesty's Household, having been created Viscount Hawkesbury of Kirkham, in the county of York, and of Mansfield, in the county of Nottingham, and Earl of Liverpool, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Charles Robert Spencer, Lord Chamberlain of His Majesty's Household, having been created Viscount Althorp of Great Brington, in the county of Northampton, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Earl Cathcart sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Montagu of Beaulieu sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Camoys sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

Robert George Baron Windsor, having been created Viscount Windsor of Saint Fagans, in the county of Glamorgan, and Earl of Plymouth, in the county of Devon, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edward Cecil Baron Iveagh, K.P., having been created Viscount Iveagh of Iveagh, in the county of Down, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Kinross sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

Alexander John Forbes-Leith, Esquire, having been created Baron Leith of Fyvie, of Fyvie, in the county of Aberdeen, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Right Hon. John Atkinson, having been appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary under the provisions of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, with the dignity of a Baron for life, by the style and title of Baron Atkinson of Glenwilliam, in the county of Limerick, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Thomas Henry Saunderson, G.C.B., K.C.M.G., I.S.O., having been created Baron Sanderson of Armthorpe, in the county of York, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Henry Meysey Meysey-Thompson, Baronet, having been created Baron Knaresborough of Kirby Hall, in the county of York, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Herbert Stern, Baronet, having been created Baron Michelham of Hellingly, in the county of Sussex, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 13*th February*, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock. And, it being the first day of the meeting of this Parliament, pursuant to a Proclamation, Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., Clerk of the House of Commons, Arthur William Nicholson, esquire, and Thomas Lonsdale Webster, esquire, Clerks Assistant, attending in the House, and the other Clerks attending according to their duty, Sir Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie, K.C.B., Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Great Britain, delivered to the said Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., a Book containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

Several of the Members repaired to their seats.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners by Black Rod.

The House went; and a Commission having been read for opening and holding the Parliament, the Lords Commissioners directed the House to proceed to the Election of a Speaker, and to present him To-morrow, at Twelve of the Clock, in the House of Peers for the Royal Approbation.

And the House being returned;

Sir WILFRID LAWSON, Baronet, stood up, and addressed himself to the Clerk of the House (who standing up, pointed to him, and then sat down).

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

*SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Sir Courtenay Ilbert, I rise to move that, "The right hon. James William Lowther do take the Chair in this House as Speaker." I think that I can give good reasons for bringing this Motion forward. In the first place, we know that the right hon. Gentleman is an old and tried servant of this House. For many years he served as Chairman of Committees and for a short time during the last Parliament he presided over us as Speaker, and I think that I may say that in both of these capacities he was tried and not found wanting. There are comparatively few old Members in this House to-day, but I think those who are here will agree with me that I have stated correctly the qualifications of the right hon. Gentleman. They will be willing also to agree that in filling these offices the right hon. Gentleman has done so with ability, courtesy, and dignity, and those qualities taken together make what Lord Rosebery would call efficiency. Mr. Lowther was well tried during the short time I have mentioned, because he had to preside more than once over scenes of excitement, of difficulty, of storm and stress; and the strain of these scenes was much relieved in many ways by his coolness of head, calmness of demeanour, and imperturbability of temper. I will not enlarge too much on his merits. Old Members will know whether what I have said is true, and new Members must wait to find out for themselves. I will sum up my eulogium of the right hon. Gentleman by saying that in my opinion he possesses three essential qualities, or perhaps I should say three senses. First of all, he has the sense of proportion, which makes public life practical; second, he has a sense of humour which makes public life tolerable; and third, and best of all, he has common sense, which makes public life successful; or, as an old poet says, he has "good sense, which is alone the gift of Heaven." In our present circumstances we need a good man. We have a new House full of new men, full of new ideas, and probably there will be a new policy. But our minds are much exercised and much excited, and no man is so foolish as to predict what course things in general will take in this House during the coming session. This is the ninth Parliament in which I have had the honour of a seat. I have seen different kinds of Parliaments and different men in the ascendant; but in all of them I have seen, speaking generally, a desire and determination to support the authority of the Chair. I shall, indeed, be very much surprised if this House proves an exception to that rule; but I think I may promise my right hon. friend this—that as long as he is loyal to the House—and I am sure he will be—so long the House will be loyal to him. I hope that to-day he will be unanimously elected, and, if so, I trust he may enjoy a long and happy reign, and that when it comes to an end, neither he nor we may have any cause to regret the step we have taken to-day.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): Sir Courtenay Ilbert, I rise to second the Motion of the hon. Baronet with a feeling that my task is made easier by the fact that the ground which he invites us to tread is the path of confirmed experience. The object that this House has in choosing its Speakers is to secure deference and obedience to the occupant of the Chair, and also continuity in our traditions. This continuity in our traditions has been observed so steadily during the last two centuries in the matter of electing Speakers that you have to go back seventy years for the last occasion on which it was omitted, and half a century further for the last occasion before that. On such rare occasions it was that the House preferred to consider political claims rather than those high personal qualifications, which, after all, may be found in a man of the minority as probably as on the other side of the House. On no occasion can it be shown that the interests of the House have suffered from adherence to this principle of continuity. It has often worked as a safeguard to minorities. It has never impaired the just power of a majority. Reverence for the Chair is a thing not by any means easy to secure. We live in times when, as Sir Michael Hicks Beach said, the office of Speaker is becoming the most difficult which a subject of the King can be called upon to fulfil. His office becomes year by year increasingly arduous and difficult. Though I do not think anyone who has read history or memoirs will say that Party heat is greater in these days than in past days, I do think there is more activity in giving expression to Party feeling. There is ever more speaking, there is a more widespread knowledge of the forms of the House. There is an increased ingenuity in exploiting those forms. All this results in appeals to the Chair more numerous and varied in their kind than ever they were before. And, added to all this, we have the fact that the Speaker is charged with larger powers, and bears therewith responsibilities all the more grave. What qualities are they which we have to seek in the man on whom we propose to lay this tremendous charge? He must have dignity, in which is included courtesy; and from which should surely not be excluded that friendliness which makes him accessible to all Members resorting to him for advice. He must have promptitude in decision, and he cannot have promptitude without both vigilance and foresight, and without the knowledge on which foresight must be based. His knowledge must be not only a knowledge of the letter of our rules, but must reflect a definite personal impression of the spirit of our proceedings. He must have that comprehensive and complex series of qualities known the judicial spirit. He must have impartiality, firmness, and patience, and his patience must include that kind of temper which amid a storm and conflict of passion, is seen to stand unruffled and imperturbable, responsive, if at all, with some spark of genial humour of the kind which, while not derogating from the dignity of his office, or the weight of the decision, goes far to disarm resentment in the person or the party against whom the decision goes. This last is a quality which must be born, and cannot be acquired. Lastly, there is another quality, likewise unattainable, I mean the intuitive perception which interprets on the instant that which we who have sat in this House before must describe as the sense of the House. At the risk of setting up too high a standard, I have ventured thus to catalogue the qualities which we require, and it is not always prudent thus to fill in the sketch. The reason that it is safe to-day is the same as that which makes it unnecessary for me to remind the House of the qualifications of my right hon. friend; for even if his name could have been up to this point withheld I doubt whether any Member of this House who sat in the last Parliament—and possibly the same may be said of many who did not sit in the last Parliament—when he is reminded of the dignity, the promptitude, the justice, the patience, the humour and the intuition we require in our Speaker, will not instinctively know that the man that is designated is the right hon. James William Lowther, and no other. In availing ourselves of his high personal qualities I submit that we shall be best carrying on the traditions of this House, best promoting the order and usefulness of its proceedings, and best discharging our duty to those who sent us here.

Moved, "That the right hon. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER do take the Chair of this House as Speaker,"

*The House then calling Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER to the Chair, he stood up in his place, and said: In accordance with the ancient precedents of this House, I rise to submit myself to the will and judgment of this House. Before I proceed any further, I must offer my sincere thanks to my hon. friend opposite for the very kind terms in which he has brought my name before the House. When last year I was proposed for the Speakership, it was my good luck to be proposed by the then Father of the House. I believe that my hon. friend the Member for Cockermouth is not technically entitled to claim that title; but I am sure, from the length of service which he has given to the House, that if he cares to claim it no one will refuse to him the title of Grandfather of the House. I am, indeed, proud to think that one of its oldest Members has passed such a favourable judgment upon my conduct during the years that I have sat here. To my right hon. friend on my right my sincere thanks are also due for the very kind terms in which he has referred to me. I think we entered Parliament about the same time; we have sat for many years together, and I have, during that time, been a great admirer of his assiduous but unostentatious services in this House. I am glad to think that the representative of so large a borough as that of Sheffield should, on this occasion, have joined with the representative of a county, for a part of which I have the honour to sit, in bringing my name before this House. Sir, I have been a Member of this House now for twenty-three years; and during that time it has been my good fortune to sit under three Speakers. My twenty-three years' experience of the House has made me sensible of the fact that more and more is required of those who are elected to the Speaker's Chair. Some of the qualifications have already been referred to this afternoon—impartiality, tact, readiness of decision, courtesy, and also, as my hon. friend the Member for Cockermouth suggested, a sense of humour. The House looks for those qualifications in the man whom they select for their Speaker, and rightly so. But, as time has gone on, I have doubted more and more whether in my own person those qualifications, or many of them, are to be found. However, I am borne up in attempting the difficult task which is before me—a task becoming year by year more difficult—by the reflection that the House has already had some experience of my services in the Chair, and that with that knowledge and experience it is prepared once again to invite me to undertake that arduous office. I submit myself humbly to the House in that respect, and I would make an appeal—an appeal which I am sure will not fall on deaf ears—namely, that the House will put the best construction on all my actions in the Chair; and that if I trust the House, the House will also trust me and support me with that authority which, in past days, it has seldom or never refused to its Speaker.

The House then having again unanimously called Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER to the Chair, he was taken out of his place and conducted to the Chair by Sir WILFRED LAWSON and Mr. STUART-WORTLEY, and standing on the upper step,

MR. SPEAKER-ELECT said: I wish to thank the House most sincerely for the great honour which it has done me in electing me once again to the Chair, the greatest honour which it is in the power of this House to confer on any one of its Members.

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT then took his seat in the Chair and the Serjeant-at-Arms placed the Mace on the Table.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Mr. Speaker-Elect, it is my pleasant duty to congratulate you on being again chosen as Speaker of the House of Commons, and to express, as I am sure I am justified in doing, the satisfaction and confidence with which your nomination has been viewed in every part of the House. Sir, as we have been already reminded, if indeed we required to be reminded of it, there are many old Members among us, and therefore old friends of yours, who know you from long observation as Chairman of Ways and Means, and from a more recent and shorter experience of your conduct of business in the Chair. There are others who are new Members, but their only desire is to become your friends, and although they have no personal knowledge of your high qualities and know them only by report, yet I am certain that they believe that they will receive uniformly from you that counsel and guidance which they so much require among the intricacies of Parliamentary life. But, Sir, although the House may be divided into those two classes to-day, there is one matter on which there is no division between them—it is the confidence that you will not only maintain regularity in our proceedings, but will support the traditions and dignity of this ancient and august Chamber, and that you will preserve the House from any encroachment on the part of external authority, preserve it also from any wayward action on the part of an individual Member, and preserve it, lastly, as occasion may require, from the House itself. Sir, it is in this sense, offering you the loyal and constant support of every Member of this House, it is in this sense, with these objects, with these high purposes in view, that I wish you Godspeed.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): Mr. Speaker-Elect, on behalf of those who sit on these benches, I desire to add a few sentences to the remarks which have fallen from the Prime Minister. We desire, Sir, to associate ourselves with those congratulations which have already been showered upon you, and we desire to express further our entire satisfaction with the choice which has been made in your unanimous selection to this Chair. We have every confidence that you will be a worthy guardian of the traditions of the House, and that you will ever be foremost in maintaining its privileges. You have already shown, Sir, that you know well how to discharge with dignity and firmness the arduous and responsible duties of the Chair. You possess a complete knowledge of the usages and the rules of the House, and you have shown that you know how to administer them with absolute impartiality. I feel, Sir, that I am voicing the views of all those who sit on this side of the House, when I assure you that we shall give to you a humble and loyal support, and further when I express our sincere desire that you may long have health and strength to discharge aright your arduous duties.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Mr. Speaker-Elect, on behalf of the hon. Members who occupy these benches I desire to add my congratulations to those already offered to you. There are other things to protect besides the dignity and the honour of the House. There are the rights of minorities and the rights and privileges of individual Members, and we feel, Sir, that these can be left with confidence and safety in your hands. We offer you our sincere congratulations on the honour which has been so worthily bestowed upon you.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. Speaker-Elect thereupon put the Question, which being agreed to, the House adjourned accordingly until To-morrow, and Mr. Speaker-Elect went away without the Mace before him.

House adjourned at five minutes before Three o'clock until Twelve o'clock To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 14*th February*, 1906.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Lords Commissioners being seated in front of the throne and the Commons being sent for:—

*Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT (addressing the Royal Commissioners): My Lords, I have to acquaint your Lordships that, in obedience to His Majesty's commands, His Majesty's most faithful Commons have in the exercise of their undoubted rights and privileges proceeded to the election of a Speaker, and that their choice has fallen upon myself. I now present myself at your Lordships' bar and submit myself with all humility for His Majesty's gracious approbation.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: We are commanded to assure you that His Majesty is so fully sensible of your zeal in the public service, and of your undoubted sufficiency to execute all the arduous duties of the position which his faithful Commons have selected you to discharge, that he does most readily approve and confirm you as their Speaker.

*Mr. SPEAKER: My Lords, I submit myself with all humility and gratitude to His Majesty's gracious commands. It is now my duty, in the name of and on behalf of the Commons of the United Kingdom, to lay claim by humble petition to His Majesty to all their ancient and undoubted rights and privileges, especially to freedom of speech in debate, to freedom from arrest, and to free access to His Majesty whenever occasion shall require, and that the most favourable construction shall be put on their proceedings. In regard to myself, I pray that if in the discharge of my duties I shall inadvertently fall into any error, it may be imputed to myself alone, and not to His Majesty's most faithful Commons.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: Mr. Speaker, we have it further in command to inform you that His Majesty does most readily confirm all the rights and privileges which have ever been granted to, or conferred upon, the Commons by himself or by any of his Royal predecessors. With respect to yourself, Sir, though His Majesty is sensible that you stand in no need of such assurance, His Majesty will ever place the most favourable construction upon your words and actions.

Several Lords took the oath.

Sir Alfred Charles William Harmsworth, Baronet, having been created Baron Northcliffe of the Isle of Thanet, in the county of Kent, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edmund Beckett Faber, esquire, having been created Baron Faber of Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

William Henry Grenfell, esquire, having been created Baron Desborough of Taplow, in the county of Buckingham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edmond George Petty Fitzmaurice, esquire, commonly called Lord Edmond George Petty Fitzmaurice, having been created Baron Fitzmaurice of Leigh, in the county of Wilts, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Newlands sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.

Writs and Returns electing the Earl of Wicklow a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Earl of Lanesborough, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto; delivered (on oath), and certificate read.

Several Lords took the oath.

The right hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, Baronet, having been

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

created Viscount St. Aldwyn of Coln St. Aldwyn, in the county of Gloucester, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The right hon. Sir Arthur Divett Hayter, Baronet, having been created Baron Haversham of Bracknell, in the county of Berks, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The right hon. Charles Hare Hemphill having been created Baron Hemphill of Rathkenny and of Cashell, in the county of Tipperary, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

Sir James Joicey, Baronet, having been created Baron Joicey of Chester-le-Street, in the county of Durham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Charles Henry Wilson, esquire, having been created Baron Nunburnholme of the city of Kingston-upon-Hull, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir William Henry Wills, Baronet, having been created Baron Winterstoke of Blagdon, in the county of Somerset, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Lord Bishop of Oxford took the oath.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock, to Friday next, half-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 14*th February*, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the clock, and Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT having taken the Chair,

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners by Black Rod,

The House went; and, being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported, That the House had been in the House of Peers, where His Majesty was pleased by His Majesty's Commissioners to approve of the choice the House had made of him to be their Speaker, and that he had in their name and on their behalf by humble petition to His Majesty made claim to their ancient and undoubted rights and privileges, particularly to freedom from arrest and all molestation of their persons, to freedom of speech in debate, to free access to His Majesty when occasion shall require, and that the most favourable construction should be put upon all their proceedings; which he said His Majesty, by his said Commissioners, had confirmed to them in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted or allowed by His Majesty, or any of his Royal predecessors.

And then Mr. SPEAKER repeated his very respectful acknowledgments and grateful thanks to the House for the great honour they had done him.

Mr. SPEAKER then put the House in mind that their first duty was to take and subscribe the oath required by law.

Thereupon Mr. SPEAKER first alone, standing upon the upper step of the Chair, took and subscribed the oath.

Then several Members took and subscribed the oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the affirmation required by law.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 15*th February*, 1906.

TOOK THE OATH.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn till Monday next,"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-three minutes after Four o'clock until Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 16*th February,* 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 19*th February*, 1906.

THE KING'S SPEECH.

THE KING, being seated on the Throne, and the Commons being at the Bar with their Speaker, His Majesty was pleased to make a most gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and then retired.

His Majesty's Speech was as follows:—

"*My Lords and Gentlemen,*

The lamented death of the King of Denmark, to whom I was united by the closest ties of family and affection, has caused Me much sorrow, and I feel convinced that the sympathy of the country will be extended to Queen Alexandra, who, in consequence of Her severe bereavement, is prevented from accompany Me on the important occasion of the opening of the new Parliament.

The Prince and Princess of Wales left last autumn for India, and are visiting as many portions of My vast Empire as time will admit of. The reception they have met with from all classes has been most gratifying to Me, and I trust that their visit will tend to strengthen, among My subjects in India, the feeling of loyalty to the Crown and attachment to this country.

It was with real satisfaction that I received the King of the Hellenes, who is so closely related to Me, as My guest during the autumn. His Majesty's visit will, I am confident, confirm the friendly ties which have so long governed the relations existing between the two countries.

My relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly.

I rejoice that the war between Russia and Japan has been brought to an end by the satisfactory conclusion of the negotiations commenced last August, and due to the initiative of the President of the United States, which resulted in an honourable peace.

An Agreement has been concluded with the Government of the Emperor of Japan prolonging and extending that which was made between the two Governments in January 1902. Its text has already been made public.

The Conference summoned by the Sultan of Morocco to consider the introduction of reforms into his Kingdom has assembled at Algeciras, and Delegates from the Powers Signatories of the Madrid Convention of 1880 are engaged in deliberations, which still continue. It is earnestly to be hoped that the result of these negotiations may be conducive to the maintenance of peace among all nations.

The dissolution of the union between Sweden and Norway has been peacefully accomplished, and, in accordance with the declared desire of the Norwegian people, My Son-in-law and Daughter, the Prince and Princess Charles of Denmark, have ascended the Throne of Norway as King and Queen.

The insurrectionary movement in Crete has subsided, and the four Protecting Powers have appointed Commissioners with a view to the introduction of reforms in the island.

The condition of the Macedonian vilayets, though in some respects improved, continues to give cause for anxiety. The Sultan has agreed to the appointment of an International Financial Commission to supervise the financial administration of these provinces, and I trust that this may lead to the introduction of salutary reforms and the improvement of the condition of the population.

Papers will be laid before you respecting Army administration in India.

In order to establish responsible government in the Transvaal Colony, I have decided to recall the Letters Patent which provided for the intermediate stage of representative government, and to direct that the new Constitution be drawn up with as much expedition as is consistent with due care and deliberation in all particulars. The elections to the first Legislative Assembly, which had been expected in July, must accordingly be postponed, but it is not anticipated that the additional delay need extend beyond a few months.

The directions which have been given that no further licences should be issued for the importation of Chinese coolies will continue in force during that period.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

A Constitution granting responsible government will also be framed for the Orange River Colony.

It is my earnest hope that in these Colonies, as elsewhere throughout My dominions, the grant of free institutions will be followed by an increase of prosperity and of loyalty to the Empire.

The Colonial Conference, which, in existing circumstances, cannot be held this year, has been postponed until the early part of next year, with the concurrence of the Colonial Governments concerned.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

I note with satisfaction that the imports and exports of the country continue to show a steady and accelerating increase, and, together with the growing activity of trade at home, indicate that the industries of My people are, in general, in a sound and progressive condition.

The additions which have been made in recent years to the national expenditure and to the capital liabilities of the State are matters to which I invite your earnest attention.

The Estimates of charge which will be laid before you will be presented in as moderate a form as time and circumstances have allowed.

My Lords and Gentlemen,

My Ministers have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies in the system of government in Ireland and for introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs. It is my desire that the government of the country, in reliance upon the ordinary law, should be carried on, so far as existing circumstances permit, in a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people; and I trust that this may conduce to the maintenance of tranquility and of good feeling between different classes in the community.

The social and economic conditions of the rural districts in Great Britain require careful consideration. Inquiries are proceeding as to the means by which a larger number of the population may be attracted to and retained on the soil, and they will be completed at no distant date.

A Bill will be laid before you at the earliest possible moment for amending the existing law with regard to Education in England and Wales.

Bills will also be submitted to you for dealing with the law regulating Trade Disputes, and for amending the Workmen's Compensation Acts; for the further Equalisation of Rates in the Metropolis, and for amending the Unemployed Workmen Act.

Your attention will also be called to measures dealing with the Merchant Shipping Law, for amending and extending the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, for amending the Labourers (Ireland) Act, for checking commercial corruption, for improving the law regarding certain Colonial Marriages, for abolishing the property qualification required of County Justices in England, and for the prevention of plural voting in Parliamentary Elections.

Your labours upon these and upon all other matters I humbly commend to the blessing of Almighty God."

Several Lords took the oath.

The Lord Leigh sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

The right hon. Sir William Hood Walrond, baronet, having been created Baron Waleran of Uffculme, in the county of Devon, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Philip James Stanhope, esquire, commonly called the hon. Philip James Stanhope, having been created Baron Weardale of Stanhope, in the county of Durham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Charles Lord Bishop of Birmingham, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords took the oath.

The Earl Cairns sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

Several Lords took the oath.

SELECT VESTRIES.

Bill, pro formâ, read 1^{a}.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The Marquess of NORTHAMPTON: My Lords, I beg to move that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty thanking him for his gracious Speech from the Throne. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me that our special thanks are due to His Majesty for having personally opened Parliament at the beginning of this session. We must all feel that his personal inclinations would have taken him to Denmark to accompany Her Majesty, but the King subordinated his private wishes to a kingly duty, and we owe him our thanks for having done so. We also would like, I feel sure, to express our sympathy with their Majesties in the sorrow which has just come upon them. The late King of Denmark had endeared himself to his subjects; he was a wise and good ruler, and was also the centre of the happiest and most affectionate family life. I am sure I am only echoing the feelings of your Lordships when I tender to their Majesties the expression of our deepest sympathy with them in their sorrow, and assure them that the expression is not a mere form of words but comes from our hearts.

We regret the absence of Her Majesty to-day, and we also notice the absence of two other members of the Royal Family. We have been watching with the greatest interest and increasing satisfaction the Royal progress of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales throughout the great dependencies of India, and we can congratulate His Majesty upon the wisdom which he has shown in sending the Heir Apparent and his Princess on a mission for cementing still closer all parts of the Empire to the British Throne. We are glad to think that that mission has been so successful. Its success has been proved by the enthusiasm with which their Royal Highnesses have been received by the peoples of India, and also by the fact that all the great Princes and Chiefs of the various States have vied with each other in according them a splendid and royal welcome as a mark, as a further mark, of their loyalty and attachment to their Emperor.

My Lords, I now pass to the paragraph which refers to our relations with Foreign Powers, and I will say how thankful we all are that the old phrase can still be used that friendly relations exist between this country and all other nations. With some the friendly relations have been strengthened during the past twelve months. The visit of the King of the Hellenes was an additional proof of the great friendship which has always existed between ourselves and the Greek nation; the agreement with Japan has been prolonged and strengthened; and the *entente cordiale* with France has also been strengthened by the interchange of visits by the two great municipalities of Paris and London. We are thankful to be able to say that at this moment the world is at peace, and, although there may be international difficulties, yet wherever those difficulties are the sword is sheathed and peaceful diplomacy is at work.

I am glad to think that the policy of His Majesty's Government as regards foreign affairs has been distinctly declared, and that that policy is one of continuity. As one who served for many years in the diplomatic service, I can bear witness that there is nothing more dangerous to the interests of this country than that there should be even a suspicion in the minds of foreign nations that a change of Government would mean a change of policy in our foreign affairs. Another lesson I learned from serving under such great diplomatic masters as Lord Lyons and Lord Dufferin was that when one made a public speech on foreign affairs, and when the most delicate International questions were being discussed and deliberated, it was wise to observe an extreme reticence and discretion. I only wish that that reticence and discretion could be observed not only by all public men, but by all leader writers in the Press. I would, therefore, only say, as regards Morocco and the Algeciras Conference, that there seems to be only two points of difficulty—perhaps one of extreme difficulty—but we can safely leave, as far as we are concerned, in the hands of our able representative, Sir Arthur Nicholson, the duty which has been imposed upon him by His Majesty's Government of giving a full diplomatic support to our friend and neighbour, France, and at the same time not giving a sign of hostility to any other nation. Our hope, and as far as I am concerned, my belief, is that a successful determination will come from the efforts of the Conference. Able diplomatists are at work, and I believe that the work of able diplomatists will always be successful.

I will now, my Lords, leave foreign affairs and address myself to matters which effect our Empire and the mother country. The first paragraph that I will allude to is that which refers to the Transvaal and to the Orange River Colony. It is stated clearly that responsible government will be granted, which means that the proposal of the late Government will not be carried out. I think it would have been quite impossible for any Liberal Government to have come to any other conclusion. I cannot imagine anything more dangerous than to grant, as was proposed to be granted, representative government without imposing upon the representative assemblies the sobering influence of responsibility. I cannot think that the Crown Colony system, as it is called, can be a good one, for it contains in it an element of the maximum of friction which may come between the Representative Assemblies in the Colonies and the Home Government. I am, therefore, glad that His Majesty's Government determined to deal with this matter with a generous hand. I am also glad that it is not to be done in haste, but that full information is to be procured as regards all the details that are necessary in order to arrive at the best form of government to be given; and I can only re-echo the words of His Majesty's speech, that it is our belief and hope that these new Colonies will, as time goes on, prosper as our other Colonies have done, knowing that they have the full responsibility of government on their shoulders. The question of Chinese labour—a question which has been a good deal ventilated lately—will be handed over to the new Government in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. I am extremely glad that so many of your Lordships approve of that. I regret, and regret intensely, that at the eleventh hour new licences were granted, but, as far as I can understand from what has fallen from the legal advisers of His Majesty's Government, that action was irrevocable. No more licences, however, are to be allowed until the Colonies have settled the question for themselves. I feel that it is a question that should be left for those on the spot to decide.

Now, as regards home affairs, I turn for one moment to the paragraph in the Speech relating to Ireland. No actual legislative measure is either defined or foreshadowed in that paragraph, but a policy is clearly laid down which must ultimately, I suppose, take shape. From my experience in Ireland during two of the worst years in the history of that unfortunate country, I feel convinced that some part of the devolution schemes which have been brought forward contain a good deal that is useful and right, and I also feel that the more we can entrust to the Irish people the administration of their local affairs the better it will be for Ireland. I am glad that the policy of His Majesty's Government will be to develop, and perhaps to carry still further, that policy which seemed to be the policy of the late Government up to a certain date, and that the policy of devolution such as we imagined was going to be carried out by Mr. Wyndham will take effect in years to come. As a well-wisher to Ireland, as one who thoroughly realises the feelings of the Irish people as regards the mismanagement—I will not say more—of Irish affairs in the distant past, and as one who also can thoroughly realise their aspirations for the future, I sincerely hope that a good deal will be done in order to give the Irish people a greater share of the management of their own local affairs, while maintaining the unity—for it must be preserved—of the United Kingdom with Ireland.

I pass to the thorny subject of education. I do not think, after the determined opposition which the late Government's Act has met with, after all that has been said of that Act since, and after the result of the general election, it will come as surprise to your Lordships to know that an amending Act is to be introduced. I do not think it will even be a surprise to the Episcopa

Bench or to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is popularly supposed to be the godfather of the Education Act. I, of course, am quite unaware of what the amending Act will be. Perhaps I may be considered a little unwise, but I will venture to state my personal opinion at all events as to what one part of it should be. I feel that I cannot maintain silence on the subject of religious teaching in our schools, as I occupy a position in many great religious societies which would make my silence seem perhaps cowardly—at all events, it would be difficult to explain. No one who knows me will fancy for one moment that I am a secularist, but at the same time I feel—and feel deeply—that no system of National Education will ever commend itself to the vast mass of the people, belonging as many of them do to different sects and different denominations—no system will be considered satisfactory, if it is a State-paid system and a compulsory system, as long as any denominational religion is taught in the schools during school hours.

For myself, I think we who lay so much stress upon the religious teaching of children should be content that the simplest bible teaching should be given. I say the simplest, because I think there is a danger that the Bible might be considered by the children only as a lesson-book, to be thrown away as the other lesson-books are thrown away when the joyful moment of escape from school-life arrives. I hope that when the amending Act is brought before us some of the old passions will have passed away, and that the country will be able to give a calm and deliberate judgment on the matter. I am glad to say that one right step has already been taken by the new Minister for Education, for in the newspapers this morning it is announced that money will be forthcoming in order to give further aid to our secondary schools, of which they stand sadly in need, and also further aid in the building of training colleges for the teachers. On those subjects I imagine that your Lordships will be unanimous.

I will refer to only two other matters. The first is the subject of the equalisation of rates for London, of which, as a London landlord in the East End, I shall heartily approve; and the other the abolition of plural voting, which, after all, has been before the country for a great many years. I fought something like seven contested elections in eleven years, and know that that subject was always a very prominent one in my programme. When the time arrives I shall be able to give a fuller explanation, but I did come across what I considered to be gross unfairness as regards plural voting, and I think in these times plural voting should be considered as an anachronism and unfair and should be abolished. I am therefore glad to think His Majesty's Government are going to introduce a measure to abolish plural voting. These, with other reforms which will be referred to by my noble friend beside me in seconding the Address, will come before us in due time, and will, of course, meet with objection, and, I am afraid, a good deal of opposition. It would be affectation to pretend to think that these measures will receive the hearty approval of the majority of your Lordships. I regret that that is the case, but I understand it to be the duty, or, at all events, the practice of this House when Liberal Reform measures are brought before it, to put on one side as far as possible party and political opinions, and to give due weight to all the circumstances which have brought such measures into existence. My Lords, I think you will all agree with me that the general election has at all events taught us one great lesson, and that is that there has been a gradual increase, all the stronger because it has been gradual, of democratic feeling and progressive thought. The measures which will be brought before your Lordships this Session and in future Sessions will be the fruit of that feeling, and I trust that as time goes on and we have these measures in full detail before us, we shall be able not only to give a calm and impartial deliberation to them, but also our ultimate consent. I beg to move.

LORD HERSCHELL: My Lords, on rising to second the Address I must ask your Lordships to accord to me a full measure of that courteous indulgence which I understand it has ever been the custom to extend to those who rise to address this House for the first time.

I hope your Lordships will allow me to say what gratification I have had at the honour which I know it to be of being selected to second the Address in reply to His Majesty's most gracious Speech. But before proceeding with my observations I hope your Lordships will permit me to say how much we feel the absence from our midst to-day of one well-known figure—I need hardly say I refer to Earl Spencer, whose ever-ready courtesy, quick sympathies, and many sterling qualities endear him alike to all, to his political opponents as well as to his political friends. I myself feel, in a particular measure his absence, owing to the very great friendship which existed for so many years between the noble Earl and my father, and I know that your Lordships will all join with me in wishing him a speedy recovery.

I should like to associate myself with the noble Marquess whose speech we have just heard in his expressions of the deepest sympathy with Their Majesties the King and Queen in their overwhelming bereavement, and in doing so I am confident I voice the sentiments of every Member of your Lordships' House. Allusion is made in the gracious Speech to the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales to India. This visit cannot fail to be a source of gratification to all concerned, to ourselves and to our Eastern fellow subjects; it has been made the occasion of yet another display of the utmost loyalty and attachment to the Throne, and will serve as a further tie to strengthen that unanimity of feeling which does exist, and which it is so desirable should exist, between the peoples of India and the people of this country. There is, I suppose, no one who can fail to rejoice at the happy termination of the war between Russia and Japan—a war which one might, without exaggeration, characterise as the most portentous conflict that the world has ever seen, portentous not only in the valour displayed but also in the unprecedented loss of life on both sides; and I am sure your Lordships will agree that a debt of gratitude is owed by the whole civilised world to President Roosevelt, of the United States of America, for his good offices and timely assistance, which so materially contributed to the inception and ultimate success of the peace negotiations. The hand of friendship has been proffered and accepted by the two nations, and I trust I may be allowed to express the hope that now that the clouds of war have rolled away they may be on the eve of a new era of vigorous internal development, which will inevitably lead to an increase of material prosperity and happiness to both nations.

This leads me to the Agreement with Japan. The whole world can feel nothing but admiration for the way in which Japan has, in a period so brief as to be without parallel in history, attained the position among the nations of the world which she now occupies. Your Lordships will have noticed in the Gracious Speech that the Agreement entered into with Japan in January, 1902, has been prolonged and extended. This can be nothing but a source of satisfaction to all. The cordial feelings of goodwill which exist at present between the two countries and the various interests, commercial and otherwise, which affect ourselves, of the islands of the West and our allies of the islands of the East, have combined to make this Agreement particularly suitable; for surely, my Lords, the soundest basis of any Agreement, political or otherwise, is community of interests. I should like to express my conviction that there is nothing in this Agreement which could possibly, in any way, militate against those friendly relations which now exist, and which I am confident we shall ever strive to maintain in the future, between ourselves and Russia. Finally, my Lords, as to our part of the Agreement, I feel sure that we shall adhere strictly to all the engagements entered into, not only in the letter but also in the spirit of the Agreement, which is the maintenance of the peace of the whole world.

Your Lordships will have seen in the gracious Speech that the dissolution of the union of Sweden and Norway has taken place. We cannot but rejoice that the difficulties which existed between these two peoples should have been settled in so peaceable a manner, and I know I am expressing the sentiments of all your Lordships when I say that we offer a humble and heartfelt wish that the reign of Norway's King and of the English Princess who is his Queen may be a long one, fraught with happiness for them and prosperity for the people over whom they have been called to rule.

I now come, my Lords, to the reference to Macedonia. This province has always presented innumerable difficulties in opposition to a satisfactory solution of the question as to what precisely is the best form of Government for its peculiar needs. The various warring elements, racial and religious, which exist among its curiously mixed population have ever been a series of stumbling-blocks in the way of reform. Pressure has repeatedly been brought to bear on the Turkish Government with a view to ameliorating the unhappy conditions which obtain in that province. In fact, efforts in this direction have been unceasing one might say ever since the time of the Berlin Treaty. Unfortunately, the procrastination of the Porte, assisted to a certain extent by the slow action of the European Concert, has up to the present practically left matters *in statu quo*; and, in spite of the assurances of goodwill of His Majesty the Sultan, and his doubtless beneficent intentions, the numerous steps which have been taken so far have resulted in comparatively little actual progress. It is therefore with feelings of particular thankfulness that we now learn that His Majesty the Sultan has definitely accepted an International Financial Commission, which I believe is already at work.

Your Lordships will also have learned from the gracious Speech that papers will be laid before Parliament dealing with Army Administration in India. When the present Government came into power the question of Army Administration in India was only partially settled, and it is satisfactory to know that every possible effort is being made to arrive at a happy solution of any difficulties which may exist. Allusion is made in the gracious Speech to the forthcoming Colonial Conference. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me that these Conferences are of the highest importance in that they afford an opportunity to us of the Mother Country of having laid before us the views on various subjects which are held by the people of the Colonies, and the interesting and instructive discussions which take place on the occasion of these conferences enable us on both sides to take a wider and at the same time a deeper and more intelligent view of questions which must of necessity to a large extent depend upon the diverse conditions, local and social, which affect them in each particular case.

I now turn, my Lords, to a subject purely concerning our own country, one which has for some time past been very seriously exercising the minds of all those who have the real welfare of the country most at heart. I refer to the long-continued exodus of our rural population from their homesteads, and their migration to the towns. The effect of this has been twofold; in the first place, the agricultural districts have been practically depleted, and villages which formerly contained a race of stalwart yeomen and healthy labourers do not now any longer afford sufficient attraction to the youth and are left to fall into gradual decay, inhabited only by the old and infirm. Farmers all over the country complain that it is impossible for them to find labourers. Apparently high wages (no consideration being given to the enhanced cost of living), the tawdry attractions and the fictitious brilliancy of the towns have drained our rural districts of their natural inhabitants.

This, my Lords, is the first cause of anxiety. I will now proceed to touch upon the second aspect of the question which is of no less grave import. The result of the constant stream of arrivals in the towns has been that terrible condition of overcrowding which is to be seen in all our great cities. These centres, already too densely populated, receive daily, fresh recruits from the country, for whom there is no space. The children of this particular section of the community come into the world and are brought up breathing tainted atmosphere in squalid courts, in strong contrast to the free and open-air existence which their parents enjoyed as children, and to which they have every right. The penalty which nature imposes upon all those who disregard her laws becomes shortly apparent in the ever-increasing number of stunted youths, with narrow chests and pallid faces, who testify in a manner all too striking to the inevitable physical deterioration which is going on, and which will continue among these people who are subject to the conditions to which I have alluded. I shall not dilate upon the moral side of the question, although this must appeal very strongly to those who are cognisant of what surroundings are most conducive to moral deterioration, or the reverse. It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to hear that inquiries are being instituted with a view to remedying this state of affairs.

Your Lordships will have noticed amongst the Bills mentioned in the gracious Speech one for regulating trade disputes. Some two years ago a judicial decision of this House came as a surprise to many persons, and a considerable amount of perturbation and dissatisfaction was caused by the discovery of the fact that what had hitherto been considered to be the law was now found not to be the law. It is, therefore, with pleasure that we hear that His Majesty's Government intend to take an early opportunity of considering this important question. For many years we have had in Parliament representatives of a certain political force whose number has been strongly augmented by the recent elections, and I cannot but feel that their knowledge and advice will be of the greatest possible use when two of the Bills mentioned in the gracious Speech—namely, the Workmen's Compensation Bill, and the Bill for amending the Unemployed Workmen Act—come up for discussion in another place.

I now come, my Lords, to the Bill for the amendment of the law regarding certain colonial marriages. I approach this subject with particular interest, because, if your Lordships will pardon the personal allusion, it is intimately connected with a question on which my father held very strong views, although I understand that his advocacy of it did not always meet with the approbation of a certain portion of your Lordships' House. Your Lordships are doubtless aware that there is a very grave feeling of dissatisfaction in certain colonies regarding the disabilities attaching in this country to marriages which, although perfectly legal in those colonies, are not regarded by the law in this country as precisely on a par in all respects with other marriages. I need hardly say that I allude to the case of a man who has married his deceased wife's sister. This marriage is strictly legal in the colonies, and, as such, carries with it all the conditions of a legal union. Should, however, the man come to live in this country, acquire property here, and subsequently die intestate, his children are regarded in this particular conjunction by the law as if they were illegitimate, and consequently they are incapable of inheriting property. I feel sure that any measure which aims at removing this disability and the inevitable stigma attached thereto cannot fail to commend itself to your Lordships' sense of justice. I will not detain your Lordships longer, and I have only to thank you most sincerely for the courtesy and patience with which you have listened to me. I beg to second the Address.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty thanking him for his gracious Speech from the Throne."—(*The Marquess of Northampton.*)

* THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, it falls to my lot to be the first to congratulate the two noble Lords to whom we have just listened, on the manner in which they have performed the somewhat difficult task which has been allotted to them. The noble Marquess who spoke first addresses this House with an authority derived from varied experience. He is still remembered gratefully by those who served with him in the Diplomatic Service. He has occupied a seat in the House of Commons, and he has from time to time taken an honourable part in our debates, and besides that, being, as he is, a large landowner in this city, he has never allowed himself to forget that property has its responsibilities as well as its rights, and he has never failed to interest himself in all philanthropic objects directed to the improvement of the condition of the poor and suffering classes of the London population.

The noble seconder, so far as I am aware, has a better right to represent himself as a novice; but, although he addressed us with a modesty and self-restraint which, I am sure, gained all our sympathy, we could not detect any of the imperfections or deficiencies by which the oratory of beginners is sometimes characterised. We hope he will often take part in our discussions, and any contribution to our debates from the son of his father will be gratefully received by this House, where the late Lord Herschell's memory is held in such great respect.

My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will readily concur in all that fell from the two noble Lords in regard to the earlier paragraphs of the gracious Speech. This House will certainly not withhold its sympathy from the Sovereign of the country and his Consort in their mourning for the venerable Monarch who has lately been taken from them. The joys and sorrows of the Royal Family are our joys and sorrows, and we all of us deeply sympathise with Her Majesty in the bereavement which prevented her from standing by His Majesty's side this afternoon. With reference to the question of the Prince and Princess of Wales' visit to India, I think the noble Marquess who leads the House and the noble Earl who sits on his left (The Earl of Elgin) will not differ from me when I say that only those who have lived in India and mixed with the people of that country can appreciate the intense respect and devotion with which the Sovereign of the Empire and those who are closely connected with him are regarded by the people of India, without distinction of race or creed.

The noble Lord who seconded touched upon a personal topic which I am sure must be present to the minds of many of us—I mean the absence of Lord Spencer. I suppose that a year ago, if there was one anticipation which we all of us thought it possible to make, it was that in the event of a change of Government we should find Lord Spencer acting as the new Leader of this House. No one could have been more pre-eminently fitted for that position. Lord Spencer's long experience in the House of Lords, the tact with which he has led the Opposition, the sincerity and straightforwardness of his character, combine to make us regard him as one, above all others, fit for that high position. We deeply regret that the state of his health should deprive him of that honour, and should deprive this House of his wise guidance at a time when perhaps it may be much required. I hope the noble Marquess Lord Ripon will not suppose that when I use these words I say anything derogatory to his fitness for the position. We regard him, if I may say so, as a veteran of whom this House is justly proud.

In the King's Speech I find with satisfaction reference made to the satisfactory character of our present arrangements with foreign Powers. But, before I pursue that subject, may I be permitted to say one word with regard to the terrible misfortune which has overtaken the Minister who is at present in charge of the foreign affairs of this country? None of the noble Marquess's colleagues assumed office with more general goodwill or support. I do not think any private sorrow has ever more deeply moved the public mind, and it is with no ordinary emotion that we offer to Sir Edward Grey our sympathy in the great trial which he has to bear.

It is deeply satisfactory to us that His Majesty should be able to tell us that his relations with foreign powers are friendly, because we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that there are many quarters in which the political atmosphere is somewhat highly charged. The noble Marquess spoke in appropriate terms of the Conference now sitting at Algeciras. We must all join in His Majesty's hope that that Conference may be conducive to the maintenance of peace among all nations. Morocco has been for many years past the Alsatia of Northern Africa. It has been a country so misgoverned that we have been liable at any moment to find ourselves confronted by incidents likely to disturb the international peace. I earnestly trust that no international rivalries may be allowed to stand in the way of a durable settlement of these difficulties.

I venture to make one observation only, and it is this—that in cases of this kind one naturally looks with a good deal of misgiving to any attempt to obtain the better administration of a disorderly country by the establishment of international control. We have had not infrequent experience of attempts to set up such control, and they have not been encouraging. I suspect that the best hope of a satisfactory solution in such cases is to be found when, with the consent and goodwill of all the Powers interested, and with proper precautions for safeguarding their interests, a single Power, always assuming that such a Power is so situated as to be able efficiently to perform the task, can be induced to take upon itself an undivided responsibility for the maintenance of a better organised and better administered Government.

We must all of us have learned with concern that the union of the dual monarchy—a monarchy united to this country by so many historical ties and associations—could no longer be maintained. It was the universal desire of all of us that if there was to be a dissolution of the union, that dissolution should be effected with as little friction as possible and should leave behind it as few traces as possible of ill will. As one who had special opportunities of watching the process by which that dissolution was effected, I may perhaps be permitted to express my admiration at the tact and moderation which was exhibited by both the countries concerned in that transaction. It is earnestly to be hoped that the relations of the two kingdoms may be of such a kind as to enable them to maintain for the future the friendship and intimacy which it is clearly desirable should subsist between them, and that they should be of a kind which will enable this country to maintain with the Scandinavian Peninsula the friendly arrangements which have always united Great Britain with Sweden and Norway in the past. I need not say that the fact that the throne of Norway is to be occupied by a prince, who, by his marriage with an English Princess has become a member of our Royal Family, adds to our solicitude that this should be the case.

The paragraph in which His Majesty refers to Macedonia strikes, as might be expected, a note of anxiety. We have had from time to time frequent discussions in this House upon the subject of Macedonia, and I think that most of those who have taken part in those discussions have expressed their disappointment at the tardy progress which has been made in bringing about a better administration of that part of south-eastern Europe. I do not know that if blame is to be imputed, that blame attaches to this country. I believe, on the contrary, that the history of the last few years will show that the British Government has consistently taken a leading part in pressing upon the other Powers the necessity of improving the administration in Macedonia. A long step was, I think, taken last year when, not without difficulty, the Turkish Government was induced to accept the appointment of a Commission to deal with the finances of Macedonia. We have always believed that without financial reform, reforms of any other character were not to be looked for, and I trust that the labours of the Commission may be productive of useful and permanent results. We may have, I dare say, before long important papers on this subject laid upon the table of the House.

May I say, speaking for those who sit beside me, that with regard to all questions of foreign affairs, although the noble Marquess will find us anxious for information, he will never find us disposed to press for such information when it is undesirable in the public interest that it should be given? Looking back to my five years experience as the representative of the Foreign Office in this House, I have every reason to acknowledge the invariable consideration with which I was treated whenever questions of foreign policy came before your Lordships, and I feel quite sure I may promise reciprocity in that respect. It is all the easier for us to deal with questions of foreign policy on these lines, because we have been told that there is to be continuity of policy in foreign affairs and that we need not look forward to any sudden or precipitate reversal of the policy we ourselves have pursued during the last few years.

I cannot help expressing a wish that the same kind of continuity might be looked for in connection with other departments of Imperial policy. I wish we could look for the same kind of continuity of treatment in regard to colonial policy; but I am constrained to say that on that point I find a marked difference in the attitude of His Majesty's Government. One colonial problem in particular, I mean the problem of the introduction of Chinese labour into South Africa, seems to me, I am constrained to say, to have been treated not only on Party lines, but on the narrowest of Party lines. It has been so treated in the discussions which we have had in this House; it has been still more so treated throughout the recently concluded electoral campaign.

We have never contended that the introduction of Chinese labour into South Africa was not to be regarded as an experiment, and I will go further and say an experiment not unattended by a certain amount of risk; and we should have been the last people in the world to complain if the attitude of noble Lords opposite and their friends had been one of criticism and vigilance. But I think we have every reason to complain when we find that they have not scrupled throughout the discussions which have taken place in regard to this subject to fasten upon us the charge of having introduced into a part of the British Empire a system which they describe as one of slavery, and to impute to us that we have connived at various acts of cruelty and outrage which are said to have characterised the existence of the system of indentured Chinese labour in the Transvaal. All of us, I suppose, during the last few weeks, have had opportunities of reading the statements which have been made on this subject, and of seeing the placards which, apparently on the authority of the Party organisations, have been distributed broadcast throughout the country. It has gone as far as this, that in some parts of England wretches disguised as Chinamen, equipped with pigtails and loaded with manacles, have been paraded about the villages as illustrations of the result of the policy of the late Government.

We have a right to protest against treatment of that kind; and I venture to tell noble Lords opposite what, in my opinion, it was their duty to do if they really believed that these things were happening in South Africa. I think they should at once have instituted a full and searching inquiry into the conditions under which Chinamen were being employed, and into the particular acts of cruelty and oppression which were alleged against us. It is not too late to make such an inquiry now; we, I need not say, shall court it and receive it with approval. But what the Government have done is something quite different. They began by endeavouring to put a stop—making believe, I might almost say, to put a stop—to the further importation of Chinese coolies when a very little inquiry would have made them aware that, without illegality, it was impossible to terminate abruptly the arrival of these people. And, in the next place, they have announced that it is their intention to hand this question over entirely the to Transvaal Government.

Now, on the merits, I have no objection to allowing the Transvaal Government to deal with this question; but I say that, if noble Lords opposite were really satisfied that the condition of things which existed amongst these coolies was a condition of slavery, they had no right to prolong that state of things. But not only have they tolerated its continuance, but they are actually, as we read in the gracious Speech from the Throne, prolonging the interregnum during which this state of things is to be continued, for the elections to the first Legislative Assembly, which were to have been held in the month of July, have been postponed, although forsooth,—

> "It is not anticipated that the additional delay need extend beyond a few months."

So that you may have several months during which this condition of slavery, with all the terrible incidents which are said to accompany it, is to be prolonged and perpetuated.

We learn that the Transvaal is to be given powers of responsible government. We should like very much to know, if we can be told, a little more about the form of that government. There have been disquieting rumours to the effect that the new electoral system is to be one differing in essential particulars from that to which we have given our approval, and that it will be a system which will have the effect, and, I presume, is intended, to transfer the predominance of power from the colonists of British blood to those of the Boer community. Now the electoral basis to which we had given our approval was determined after much discussion, after full consideration of recent colonial precedents, and after a debate in Parliament in which several Members of the present Government took part—a debate in the course of which the present Prime Minister expressed in so many words his approval of the system which we had adopted, I mean a system with an electoral basis founded upon voters and not upon population. This may be a false alarm, and if it is so, the sooner the report is contradicted the better, for it is one which, both in this country and in South Africa, has been received with feelings of great uneasiness.

I turn for a moment to the paragraph in which the gracious Speech deals with Irish affairs. I do not suppose that any paragraph will have been scanned with closer attention or more anxiety than that particular paragraph. Its language is somewhat remarkable. His Majesty's Government do not announce to us the introduction of a Measure, but they tell us that they have plans under consideration—

"For improving and effecting economies in the system of Government in Ireland and for introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs."

We should certainly not grudge His Majesty's Government any length of time which may seem to them necessary for the full consideration of this most difficult subject; and, if they had told us that they had only lately assumed office and that they desired to look more fully into the matter, we should have quite understood their reasons for asking for delay. But their language is at once enigmatical and suggestive. We should like to know in what manner the people of Ireland are to be associated with the conduct of Irish affairs. The late Government passed a very far-reaching Act of Parliament which certainly had the effect, not only of associating the people of Ireland with the conduct of Irish affairs, but of giving them a very large measure of control over those affairs. I observe that the noble Marquess, in the course of his speech, twice used the words "local affairs," and I presume that he is in the secret and knows what kind of affairs are contemplated. But we may be excused for reading this passage in a somewhat critical spirit, because it is impossible for us to dismiss wholly from our minds that remarkable speech delivered by the Prime Minister, soon after his assumption of office, in which he unfolded to a wondering public the scheme which is commonly spoken of as that of Home Rule by instalments. We should very much like to know whether this is merely what I might call a reasonable and legitimate development of local self-government, or whether the new "plan" represents the first of those instalments which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman announced his intention or desire to provide for the benefit of the people of Ireland. The paragraph goes on to express His Majesty's desire that the Government of the country—

"In reliance upon the ordinary law, sholud be carried on, so far as existing circumstances permit, in a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people."

I do not suppose that any of your Lordships would for a moment desire that the people of Ireland should be denied the advantage of living under the ordinary law, so long as the ordinary law suffices for the purpose of ensuring peace and good order in that country; but it is quite clear that a reservation of that kind is present to the mind of His Majesty's Government, and has prompted the comforting reservation embodied in the words—

"So far as existing circumstances permit."

As to the expediency of governing Ireland in a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people, I believe that I only represent the views of the noble Lords behind me when I say that it is our great desire that the government of Ireland should be carried on in a sympathetic spirit and with due regard to the feelings of the people of the country; and I will undertake to say that there is no Chief Secretary whose name is more honoured in Ireland as that of an official who sought earnestly

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

to have regard to the wishes and sentiments of the people than the late Prime Minister, Mr. Arthur Balfour.

I will say only one word more with regard to Ireland. I see no reference in the Speech to an Irish question which is one, I think, of extreme importance—I mean the question of land purchase. No measure of late years has been passed that is in closer accord with the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people; and I earnestly trust that His Majesty's Government will not allow any circumstances to interfere with the proper development, and the progress of that useful measure. We have heard with some slight alarm that during the last few days the proclamations applying certain provisions of the Crimes Act have been withdrawn from, I think, nineteen districts in different parts of Ireland. These provisions, as your Lordships are perhaps aware, have reference to the use of special juries and the power of change of venue in certain circumstances. Now, if His Majesty's Government are able to tell us that the condition of these nineteen districts really has undergone a change, and that these precautionary measures, which, after all, do not interfere with the personal liberty of a single Irishman, are no longer necessary, we shall rejoice to hear that fact and we shall applaud the decision of Ministers. But we should like to know on what grounds this sudden and perhaps somewhat theatrical step has been taken.

My Lords, I will not say more than a word with regard to the promises of legislation contained in the gracious Speech. One measure will be awaited with the keenest expectation—I mean that which is to deal with the question of education. We have learned from the Minister in charge of that particular matter that the fundamental principles of the Act of 1902 are not likely to be disturbed. I rejoice to hear it; and I hope it is true that that great measure, dealing as it did more thoroughly than any of its predecessors with the question of co-ordinating education, and the position of the local authorities in regard to it, is not likely in its essential points to be disturbed.

The question that is to be dealt with is, of course, that of religious education, and there is no question which more deeply moves the convictions of the people of this country. I take it that the general feeling throughout the country is that that our children should be educated in principles of morality having behind them a higher sanction than can be derived from the inspiration of the schoolmaster or from the tenets of some Government Department. I think I am not wrong in saying, too, that the feeling of the public generally is that so far as possible the wishes of the parents should be considered, and that they should be allowed to determine what form of religious education their children are to receive. But I admit that these are very general propositions, and it is only when you get to close quarters with this most difficult question that its really embarrassing character becomes fully apparent. We have experienced these difficulties, and we shall rejoice if noble Lords opposite are fortunate in surmounting them.

Of the other measures mentioned in the King's Speech I will not at present say anything except to observe that I recognise the importance of the paragraph in which it is said that inquiries are proceeding as to the means by which a larger number of the population may be attracted to and retained on the soil. We all of us admit the desirability of arriving at that end, and we shall be glad to co-operate in any attempt to do so. I take it that the inquiries referred to are those which are being conducted by a Committee appointed by the late President of the Agricultural Department. As to the other Bills, which I see number a dozen altogether, I will only say, echoing a wish which has been not infrequently expressed on this bench — the hope that some of them, at all events, will be introduced in your Lordships' House, and that those which are introduced elsewhere may, if possible, be brought to us at a time of the year which will enable us to deal with them. That is a demand which the Opposition are privileged to put forward, and I am not at all ashamed of echoing language which has fallen from the noble Marquess opposite on more than one occasion.

I will go a little further and say that at this moment, it is for obvious reasons, especially desirable that this House should be consulted in good time as to any important measure that may be contemplated. We are confronted with a rather exceptional state of things. His Majesty's Government in the other House have a majority which I may fairly describe as colossal. In this House, on the other hand, they are confronted, not perhaps by a very solid Opposition, but still by a large body of peers who may be expected to have views of their own and to desire ample opportunities of expressing them. I hope, therefore, that arrangements will be made to provide us with those opportunities. If His Majesty's Government will treat this House with the consideration which we have a right to claim, I do not think they need be at all afraid that we shall show a disposition to obstruct the deliberately expressed wish of the constituencies of this country. In my experience I can call to mind no case in which the House of Lords has set itself deliberately to thwart a conclusion arrived at by the people of this country upon full and sufficient premises; and I venture to predict that, if His Majesty's Government, strong as they are in numbers and in collective ability, will use their opportunities with prudence and with moderation, they may expect from us not obstruction, but much useful criticism and much cordial co-operation in the difficult task that lies before them.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I have first the agreeable duty of joining with my noble friend who has just sat down in offering hearty congratulations to my noble friends behind me on the manner in which they have discharged the duty entrusted to them. My noble friend who moved the Address has had wide experience in various parts of the public service, both in diplomacy and in the House of Commons, and he has shown us to-night in his admirable speech what good use he can make of the lessons which that experience has taught him; and I venture to say that we have seldom heard a more forcible speech in moving the Address than that which fell from the noble Marquess. There is a different kind of interest in regard to the speech of the noble Lord who seconded the Address. It was an admirable speech for a first speech in this House. We are accustomed to find young men on both sides of the House come forward on occasions of this kind who are amply able to discharge the duty that is entrusted to them, and it is, I think, a source of great satisfaction that we should have found to-night in my noble friend the seconder so worthy a successor of that great lawyer whom noble Lords on both sides of the House esteemed and honoured.

We on this side of the House beg to tender our heartiest thanks to the noble Marquess who has just sat down for the kind manner in which he referred to that friend whom we so long have loved and honoured, and who we expected would on this occasion have occupied the place which I unworthily fill. My Lords, Lord Spencer is a man who has won for himself during a long series of years in this House, not only the affectionate regard of his followers, but, I venture to think, the respect and esteem of all men in this House; and it is indeed grievous to think that, struck down by an unexpected illness, he should be unable to come amongst us to-night to take that part—that honourable and distinguished part—in our discussions which he has so long taken. Occupying my present position I feel how difficult it will be for me to follow such a man as Lord Spencer, and I can only hope to accomplish the task which has been laid upon me by the aid and forbearance of my friends, and, if noble Lords opposite will pardon me for saying so, by the considerate indulgence of the House at large. Again we have to tender our thanks to the noble Marquess for the words he used in reference to the bereavement that has befallen Sir Edward Grey; and I believe he was right in saying that no misfortune to a public man, at all events for many years, has moved so deeply the sympathy of all who knew and esteemed him.

I now come to the remarks of my noble friend upon the gracious Speech from the Throne. It is needless for me to say how deeply we on this side of the House sympathise, in common with all of your Lordships, with the King and Queen in the great bereavement which has fallen upon them in the death of the King of Denmark. In that feeling we share the universal sentiment of the people of this country. The joys and sorrows of our Sovereign are shared by all his subjects; we all know the sterling affection with which the people of this country regard the Royal Family. I was not surprised at the words which fell from the noble Marquess with reference to the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to India. As he has reminded us, he knows that country well, as I also do, and he knows how deep is the respect and attachment which the people of India bear towards the Crown of this country. Certainly when I was in India there were few things which were remembered more vividly and with greater pleasure by the princes and peoples of that country than the visit of our present Sovereign when he was Prince of Wales. I have no doubt that feeling has continued, and that it will be strengthened and extended by the visit of their Royal Highnesses.

My noble friend alluded very briefly to the single line in the Speech which refers to our relations with Foreign Powers and states that those relations continue to be friendly. As His Majesty's Government have been but a short time in office, it is due that I should say to my noble friend that a large share of that satisfactory state of things is due to his able conduct of the foreign affairs of this country. We all rejoice that the war between Russia and Japan has been brought to an end. That war was one of the most terrible with which the world has ever been visited; it was marked by gallantry on both sides, and it is indeed a subject of the highest satisfaction that it should, under an arrangement honourable to both parties, have been brought to a conclusion. We cannot be too thankful to that eminent ruler, the President of the United States, for the part which he took in bringing about that peace. It reflects great honour not upon President Roosevelt alone, but upon his great country. My noble friend will naturally be anxious to know what are the intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to the recent Treaty between this country and Japan. I can assure him that we accept that Treaty in the spirit in which we believe it was made, and that it is our firm intention to carry out strictly and readily the obligations it imposes on us. We are proud of our connection with a gallant nation like Japan, and we shall certainly apply to that treaty arrangement that continuity of policy which has been already alluded to.

The noble Marquess next referred to the Conference which is going on at Algeciras. I am happy to say that that Conference is still continuing. Some persons have thought that it has been slow in its progress. Diplomatic conferences of that kind are not apt to proceed very rapidly, but I know nothing at the present time which should preclude us from hoping that it may be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Reference has been made to what is called the Declaration agreed to by this country and France in regard to Egypt and to Morocco, and that Declaration requires us to afford full diplomatic support to France. To that arrangement we entirely adhere, and His Majesty's able representative at Algeciras is so instructed. We have, no doubt, my Lords, some national interests in respect to Morocco, but they are interests chiefly in regard to the maintenance of order vital to the success of commerce, and to the keeping of the open door; and no arrangements can be better calculated to promote that end than those which have passed between ourselves and France. Therefore we stand, so far as regards our diplomatic position, on the same footing as that laid down by my noble friend opposite.

One word with regard to the dissolution of the union between Norway and Sweden. It does seem to me that there are few instances in history in which a dissolution of a connection such as that has been made in so perfectly peaceful and reasonable a manner. The noble Marquess did not allude to the state of things in Crete, and I may therefore pass that subject by, merely saying that the statement contained in the Speech shows accurately the arrangements in that matter. It is very natural that my noble friend should feel great interest in the question of Macedonia. He has had the right object before him in the difficult task which he has endeavoured to perform, and his primary object has been to maintain the concert of Europe in this matter. He has succeeded in bringing the Sultan to agree to an international financial commission, and I am able to state that the Commission has had one or two meetings, and that, so far as it is possible to judge upon so slight an experience, it seems as if it will be likely to perform the task entrusted to it satisfactorily. I believe that Hilmi Pasha, the Turkish representative, is co-operating as was to be desired with his colleagues.

My noble friend asked a question about Papers respecting the arrangements for Army administration in India. My right hon. friend Mr. Morley has given most careful consideration to the state of things which was created by changes made last year in regard to that matter—changes not made, certainly according to my idea, with much skill—and he sent a Despatch to India on the 9th of this month conveying his views. That despatch is likely to arrive on the 25th or 26th, and as soon as it has reached India Papers will be laid on the Table. I think it will be agreed that the terms of the Despatch ought not to be made public till they are in the hands of the Indian Government. My noble friend commented unfavourably on the paragraph in the Speech with reference to the state of things in South Africa, and he referred to the question of Chinese labour. He seemed to take us to task for having taken steps in reference to the employment of Chinese labour in the mines as soon as we came into office. Now I think his comments arose from a feeling which apparently has existed among the Party opposite that the objections which we have steadily urged from the beginning to the employment of the Chinese coolies in South Africa under the terms upon which they are employed were taken up for some party purpose, and that this was a matter on which we had no very strong feeling. If they have entertained that opinion it is entirely erroneous. It is a question upon which we have felt very deeply; it is a question upon which those who I have the honour to represent in this House have strong and clear convictions; and it was the absolute duty of the Government, in view of the opinions which they had deliberately formed, to consider that question at the earliest possible moment after they came into office.

My noble friend made a great complaint of the language used at the late general election, and especially of certain pictorial representations which were cast abroad in the country in respect to the condition of the Chinese. We all know that at election times many things are done which had better not have been done. If there were any representations made, any pictures put forth, which led people to think that the Chinese in South Africa were constantly going about in manacles, it was wrong. I do not pretend to say that that is the state of affairs. But I should like to remind my noble friend opposite, when he makes the complaints about electioneering proceedings, that such proceedings are not always of the most gentle and courteous description. At least, they were not so always in my days. Perhaps Lord St. Aldwyn, whom I heartily welcome of this House, might state to us, as one of its most recent importations, whether electioneering manners have improved or not since then. I would ask my noble friend, when he makes this complaint, whether he recollects a case—I think it was in the county of Cambridge—where a Liberal candidate who had lost two sons fighting on the British side in the South African War was represented as engaged with President Kruger in pulling down the British standard. I think that case, and that treatment of a man in that condition who had made those sacrifices for his country and sustained that most grievous loss, may be paired off with half a dozen of the other examples brought forward by my noble friend opposite.

I do not think that the objections which we have entertained to the introduction of Chinese labour in the Transvaal are clearly understood by noble Lords opposite. The Chinese have been introduced under very special circumstances. The arrangements made for them, and with them, are not the arrangements which are generally made for the introduction of coolie labour. I admit that in one sense, and if you were compelled to have Chinese labour at all, you were obliged to make these arrangements, but they are arrangements which, in respect to the position of those men when they are not at work, are largely inconsistent with the condition of free men.

I have never spoken of the condition of these coolies as the condition of slaves. I described it once in this House—and I adhere to the epithet—as a condition of semi-slavery. That is exactly what it has been. We have been often told that the Chinese are well treated and well fed. I do not dispute that for a moment, but good food and good accommodation do not make free men. And when you lay down rules that these men are not to engage in certain employments—the number is twenty-nine, I believe—that people who assist them in any way inconsistent with the Ordinance are to be imprisoned, and that the Chinamen are not to be allowed to remain in the country but are to be removed by force as soon as their engagement is at an end, I say that you are making arrangements which at all events in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, and I venture to believe in the opinion of all those whom they represent, ought not to be made. I know very well the dread of Chinese competition. That is the reason why these arrangements were made; but if the Chinamen are such dangerous competitors with the tradesmen and other portions of the population, as undoubtedly they are, then they are not fit people to be brought into a British Colony.

I was anxious to make these few remarks, because they represent the feeling strongly entertained by a very large portion, I believe a large majority, of the people of this country. What were we to do? We came into office, and found this thing as it was. We found these coolies at work in the mines. We did not think, however, great as might be our objection to this kind of arrangement, that it was possible for us, or that it would have been right, to take steps to prevent the continued employment of the Chinamen who were there at the time. But when we came to look into the matter we found that there were a very large number of Chinese coming over. The history of that matter is rather curious. I will not trouble your Lordships with it at this moment, but the number of licences applied for at a particular date last year sprung up in the most extraordinary manner, at the time, too, when Mr. Lyttelton was suggesting that perhaps no more would be required. We were advised that if those licences had been given between private persons it was quite clear they constituted binding contracts. Well, what did we do? We said we could not break the contracts; we would hold ourselves bound by them; and all the Chinese under those contracts are to come in. But would it not have been inconsistent with what we had said, and with our profound convictions, if we had allowed any more licences to be issued? We therefore stopped the further introduction of Chinese; but we said, in accordance with what I believe to be sound principle in this matter, that this is a question which must ultimately be decided by the people of the Transvaal themselves; and therefore we determined to take immediate steps to obtain that opinion in the most perfect manner and as quickly as possible. It may be argued—indeed I think it was argued by the noble Marquess—that we are to blame because we have not allowed Mr. Lyttelton's Constitution, if I may be permitted to call it that, to come into operation. Why have we not done that? There are several reasons.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Marquess will pardon me for interrupting him. I did not make that complaint. I suggested that there was a well-supported rumour that the new Constitution which His Majesty's Government were going to introduce was based upon an electoral system widely different from that which we had adopted.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I am coming to that. I beg the noble Marquess's pardon for attributing the complaint to him, but the complaint has been made and I will answer it. All I desire to say on that point is this, that a Constitution of that kind, consisting of elective members in a very large majority having to deal with a nominated Executive over whom they have no control, has been proved to be a very bad form of Colonial government. The sort of despotism which Crown Colony government sometimes is may be necessary in certain cases, but I do not think this intermediate stage is, or will be, a method of advancing to responsible government. With respect to the question specially put by my noble friend, I have this to say. We are about to establish as speedily as we may in the Transvaal, and ultimately in the Orange River Colony, responsible government properly so called.

It is a great and serious responsibility to construct a Constitution of that kind; and we have found ourselves obliged to take steps to obtain further information upon a variety of subjects before we can frame the Constitution which we shall ultimately establish. While we are doing that all these sorts of questions are open. The effect of the revocation of the letters patent with regard to Mr. Lyttelton's Constitution is entirely without prejudice to the full consideration of the basis on which the Constitution will ultimately be framed. I express no opinion on that basis at all. I reserve for myself and for the Government the fullest freedom to deal with the matter as they may think best. With regard to the time at which we may be able to put forward this new Constitution I can give no more definite assurance than is contained in the Speech itself. No time ought to be lost about it. I quite admit that all persons interested in the Transvaal have a fair right to demand that we should bring this business to a conclusion as soon as we can; but I am sure your Lordships will agree that it is not a matter to be hurried, not a matter to be decided hastily, and that we are bound to proceed with due deliberation, due inquiry, and due communication with South Africa before arranging the basis on which this Constitution is to be framed. In the meanwhile, as I have told your Lordships, no further licenses are to be issued for the importation of coolies.

We desire to leave the question where, in my humble opinion, it ought to be left, to the people of the Transvaal themselves; and I believe there is no effectual means of ascertaining the opinion of any country except through the intermediary of what is called responsible government. I have a feeble belief in plebiscites. I believe that a freely elected Legislature, guided by responsible Ministers possessing its confidence, is the surest and best means by which the opinion of any country can be ascertained; and it is to such a body that we intend to leave the decision of this matter. It is hinted that we ought to have decided the question out and out for ourselves. I do not think that. I believe that there is no more difficult question in connection with the responsible Government of Colonies than that which relates to the management of native races, and I believe that the Colonial Secretary has no real effective means of controlling the management of these matters by Ministers in responsible Colonies. You can veto their Bills, but you cannot control their Executive action. The moment you attempted to do anything of the kind you would be involved in infinite difficulty. Therefore, it is from no wish to shift responsibility from ourselves, but from a desire to leave to the people of the Transvaal the decision of a great question deeply concerning the future interests of that country, that the step referred to has been taken.

I need hardly say that we shall make every effort also to frame a Constitution for the Orange River Colony. I have never quite been able to understand why the late Government did not deal with the Orange River Colony at the same time as the Transvaal, but that is a question not worth discussing now. I have only one word to say about the Colonial Conference, and that is that it has been agreed with the Ministers of the various self-governing Colonies that a Conference shall be held next year—the late Government felt that it could not be held this year—and that it shall be conducted in the same manner and on the same principles as the Conferences which have preceded it; and I hope and believe we shall all derive great advantage from a Conference of that kind.

Now I come to the paragraph relating to Ireland. My noble friend opposite wants to know its meaning. He complains that it is indistinct. I can tell him this, that when we speak of improving and effecting economy in the system of government in Ireland, and introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs, we speak of matters of administration The noble Marquess alluded to the local government system which was established in Ireland by the late Government. It was a very useful step, a very good measure, and it has worked very well; but that is only a reason which should encourage us in proceeding, so far as matters of that kind are concerned, in the same direction. The present condition of the administrative government of Ireland has been criticised by many men. Most of those who have gone there—Sir West Ridgeway for instance—with very different views have come round to the belief that it is a very unsound system needing change; and it is with a view to rendering that system more suitable to the present conditions of the country that we contemplate this arrangement.

It is many years now—more than twenty years—since the Irish system of administration was denounced in the most vehement, and, as I at the time thought, exaggerated language by no less a person than Mr. Chamberlain. I know it is no use to recall Mr. Chamberlain's words in the past in reference to anything he may say or think now; but, at the same time, if your Lordships would turn back to that speech, if it is still in print, you would see in what language he denounced the administrative arrangements for the government of Ireland, and especially the boards that exist there. Those boards require to be brought more fully under the control of the central administration itself. I believe it is almost universally admitted that Boards of this kind are not the best means of conducting the administration of Ireland, and we hope to be able to make important changes in that direction without unnecessary delay. My noble friend laid great stress on the words—

> "So far as existing circumstance permit"

in reference to our desire to carry on the government of the country in reliance upon the ordinary law. Of one thing I am quite sure—namely, that if these words had been omitted from the paragraph, my noble friend would have complained of the omission. He now complains of their presence. I think they are wise and judicious words, and they have been introduced for very obvious reasons. My noble friend spoke of relying on the ordinary law. He admits—and I think all men must admit—that it is, as a rule, desirable in all countries to rely on the ordinary law where you can do so. We were advised by those responsible, who have the best means of knowing what is the present condition of Ireland, that the step which has been taken in withdrawing the clauses of the Crimes Act which were in operation in certain counties in Ireland could be taken with safety, and that being so we were bound to withdraw those clauses, and to rely on the ordinary law.

There are a good many people—and this is one of the dangers of having laws of this kind — who when they have got powers think they are bound to use them, and that if there is any little disturbance here or there it is a good thing to resort to these extreme powers. The late Count Cavour well said that any fool could govern in a state of siege. I have no doubt that in a certain sense you can govern with less trouble if you have these powers, but I venture to say that the sound principle for this country is to govern where you can and when you can without such powers, to rely, wherever possible, on the ordinary law. That is certainly the view which His Majesty's Government take of the matter; and in accordance with that view, and upon the advice which has been tendered them, they have withdrawn those special powers which have been but rarely used in most parts of the country where they have been in force during recent years.

My noble friend then referred to the paragraph relating to the agricultural districts of the country. I have no comment to make on what my noble friend said with regard to that. The Committee alluded to is the one which was established by His Majesty's late Government. We propose to await the Report of that Committee, and then we shall see what steps it is desirable to take. I should think that it would be generally admitted that the operation of the present Small Holdings Acts has been very slight and not at all satisfactory, and that a change—I should think it would be a large change—in regard to that matter has become very necessary in order to meet admitted evils.

With reference to the education question, I am not in a position to tell the House what will be the provisions of the Bill. I can only say that the subject is receiving the closest attention of His Majesty's Government. I think it must be admitted, especially looking at the result of the late elections, that the present Act cannot stand as it is. It has produced great dissatisfaction in certain quarters. You have Wales in arms against it. If my noble friend lived, as I do, in the West Riding of Yorkshire he would know the feeling there. It is impossible to leave the Act as it now stands. In the interest of every kind of school you cannot let it remain. The late Government found it necessary two years ago to introduce a special Act for enforcing the existing law. If you look at the returns of the general election in Wales you will see what is the opinion of that part of the country on the question. All I can say now is this, that the necessity of change is great, urgent, and, I believe I may say, admitted, and I hope and believe that when the proposals of His Majesty's Government come before this and the other House of Parliament, they will meet, from all those who are interested in the question, with fair and careful consideration in the hope of some satisfactory settlement being arrived at and one which can stand. For my own part I never had any faith in the Act of 1902. I never took any part in the proceedings in regard to it. I always believed that it would come to grief, but it has come to a great deal more grief than I ever expected.

My noble friend spoke of the necessity of giving your Lordships ample time to discuss measures. Noble Lords opposite had an experience last year, which they can hardly have forgotten, of the difficulty of getting Bills up to this House. The Aliens Bill, an important measure, was forced through this House in a most marvellous manner, for the Government did not even venture to move their own drafting Amendments for fear of the Bill going back again to the House of Commons. The Unemployed Bill, again, came up so late, that, though it had had struck out of it its most important clause, it was yet considered necessary to pass it through this House with what was practically the closure. Therefore I cannot undertake to make any promise whatever with respect to that matter. I wish to be frank with the House, and I make no promise, but being concerned for the interests and dignity of this House, I shall do what I can to take the Bills up quickly; but I am powerless; your Lordships are powerless. I tried to water down the optimism of my friend Lord Spencer last year. I am too old to make promises of a kind which during a long life I have seen broken so very frequently.

I think I have now touched on all the points mentioned by the noble Marquess except one—I refer to the statement which he made, and which I hail with satisfaction, as to the spirit in which, under his guidance, he hoped the Opposition would deal with the measures of His Majesty's Government. I have had too long an experience of the moderation and the skill of my noble friend who leads the Opposition not to have expected that that would be the spirit in which he would approach the matter, and I am glad that though he has a giant's power he does not seem inclined to use it like a giant. The circumstances are peculiar. There is an overwhelming majority on one side in the other House and an equally overwhelming majority on the opposite side in this House. That is a state of things which calls for all possible consideration and skill in those who have to deal with these questions in either House. The responsibility is great, and I believe, certainly so far as my noble friend is concerned, that he feels it as much as I do myself. The late general election returned, as the noble Marquess said, a strong, I might almost say an overwhelming, majority in favour of one Party and one class of opinion. That has been brought about in many ways and for many reasons. I will not enter into them now; but this at least, my Lords, I feel bound to say, that the first and plainest lesson of that Election is that the people of the United Kingdom, noting those points which are referred to in the course of the King's Speech—

> "That the imports and exports of the country continue to show a steady and accelerating increase, and, together with the growing activity of trade at home, indicate that the industries of my people are, in general, in a sound and progressive condition."

—noting these points and laying them to heart, are determined not to allow to be weakened or undermined the wise fiscal policy which for two generations has secured to them the rich enjoyment of the blessings of Free Trade.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not intend at this hour to trouble your Lordships with any long observations, and I certainly shall not be tempted by the closing remarks of the noble Marquess to enter into the subject of fiscal policy. I rise really to ask a question, and to make one comment. The question has reference to the Irish paragraph in the gracious Speech from the Throne. I do not think the noble Marquess, in replying to my noble friend, realised the question which my noble friend put to him as to the peculiarity of the language in which that paragraph is expressed. What is intended? What are these plans? Do they differ from measures? Are they to be submitted to the judgment of Parliament?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: No.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I understand the noble Marquess to say No.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I did not intend that as an answer.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Then I will put the question again. Are these plans to be submitted to the judgment of Parliament?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: They are still under consideration.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I would like to press the noble Marquess to tell us what form of consideration these plans are receiving. Is it consideration within the bosom of the Cabinet, or is a Departmental Committee considering the matter? Are we to look for the appointment of a Royal Commission, or in what form are these plans for improving the government of Ireland to be effected? Lastly, intimately bound up with the other point I have raised, I should like to ask the Government when we may expect that these plans will be laid before the country and Parliament, when these considerations will reach their conclusion. I have known Governments by referring matters for consideration postpone dealing with them for a very long period; and it may be that this paragraph is a mere device to keep the Irish supporters of His Majesty's Government in another place quiet, for a Session at least, whilst the consideration is taking place. If the noble Marquess or one of his colleagues could throw a little more light upon this we should be grateful. Then I have a comment to make. The noble Marquess spoke in a jocular vein of the kind of things which take place at election times, and said that when he stood for Parliament very wicked things used to be done. I am very sorry to hear it, but I am afraid that we, on this side of your Lordships' House are not able to treat this particular matter to which my noble friend referred in the light fashion which characterised the answer of the noble Marquess. It is not a question of some unworthy paragraph or some unfair charge made on the hustings. If that had been the whole matter, the author of any such utterances would have reason to be ashamed of himself; but no great harm would have been done. The charge that we bring against the supporters of His Majesty's Government in the country and in another place is this, that they obtained the verdict of the country upon a false charge; that they put forward that which they knew to be untrue, and that upon that the verdict of the country was given. Do they believe in this charge of slavery? Not a bit of it. The noble Marquess, speaking as the Leader of your Lordships' House and as the representative of the Government here, said—

> "I have never made this charge of slavery."

Yes; but the supporters of the noble Marquess have, and the noble Marquess would not be sitting in that place, perhaps, to-night if it had not been for this charge. If the noble Marquess does not believe in the charge of slavery, does he——

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I did not say what I believed on the question generally. I only stated that I had not said the conditions were those of slavery.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: But I daresay the noble Marquess says what he believes. If the noble Marquess and his friends do not believe these charges of slavery and cruelty, then they ought to be heartily ashamed of the conduct of their supporters on the hustings during the general elections. A belated denial of the authenticity of these placards—a denial which, I believe, came out just two days before the end of the general election—is not a sufficient answer. This denial and refusal to accept responsibility, to be effective, ought to have been made much earlier. I rose only to make these two observations, and to ask the question which I have put to the noble Marquess.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, it is, I think, a somewhat new experience, on the particular occasion of the opening of Parliament, that the debate should be prolonged beyond the speeches of the Mover and Seconder and that of the two Leaders; but I make no complaint whatever. On the contrary, it has frequently seemed to me that the practice of closing the debate in such a summary manner as has often been the case has its unfortunate side; and if, when I have sat down, any noble Lord likes to move the adjournment of the debate or proceed further with it this evening, I shall make no complaint, although I notice that we are approaching the time when your Lordships' House usually adjourns. I now come to the two matters raised by the noble Marquess. I shall not attempt to imitate him in the tone in which he addressed your Lordships at this very early stage of the Session. I am bound to say that the manner in which the noble Marquess has addressed himself to us who sit on this bench and noble Lords behind does not hold out to my mind hope of the entire fulfilment of that pledge of fair treatment from the majority which we received, and expected to receive, from the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition. I hope the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition will keep an eye on the other noble Marquess his colleague, and endeavour to exercise a moderating influence on the tone in which he addresses your Lordships. With regard to the Chinese labour question, which is the one upon which the noble Marquess spoke with most vehemence, I also, like my noble friend behind me, have never used the word "slavery" in connection with the importation of Chinese coolies into South Africa, because I do not regard it as an accurate term, and I do not suppose it is regarded as a term of art even by those who have used it. It has been regarded generally as a descriptive term. Perhaps I might be allowed to quote an analogy to your Lordships. I have often noted, in speeches made by noble Lords in this House, and by their supporters in the country, that when various provisions in connection with taxation have been brought in by Liberal Governments they have been described as "robbery." I do not suppose it would be contended that "robbery" was a technically correct term to apply. The term "slavery" was used in the same sense, as a term of general description. When people speak of Chinese labour as "slavery" they do not speak of it as being technically slavery. The term has been used as a general description of a system of labour which certainly cannot be described as free.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Does the noble Earl repudiate the word "slavery" on behalf of himself only or on the part of the whole of his colleagues?

THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not quite follow the noble Duke's meaning in asking that question. I have no doubt there are a considerable number of our supporters in the country who do regard this system as being essentially slavery, but I do not hold that view myself. I might, however, point out that it is no thanks to the former Government of the Transvaal, and not very much thanks to noble Lords opposite or to the late Government, that a provision was not included in the Ordinance which the Chinese Minister, when applied to on the subject, said in his opinion constituted what was equivalent to slavery. It was only on the representation of the Chinese Minister that that provision was omitted, and therefore I am bound to say that the indignation on the part of noble Lords opposite seems somewhat excessive. I do not pretend to be an authority on what happens at election times, but it is very common for exaggerated phrases and terms to be used. Those terms we, in this more serene atmosphere, would be sorry to use ourselves, and we are willing to express regret that they should be used. But when the noble Marquess accuses us of having got into office by statements which we knew to be untrue, I beg to protest very strongly indeed against that language. I have been a Member of your Lordships' House for twenty years, and I have never before heard such a charge made by one Member of the House against another Member or other Members of the House. I hope that, upon reflection, the noble Marquess will see the propriety and decency of withdrawing it. I am very sorry I cannot give the noble Marquess the information he desires with regard to Ireland. The whole question is under consideration, and that consideration has not yet proceeded to anything like an advanced stage. I am not even in a position to tell the noble Marquess how soon we shall be able to give any information on the subject.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Perhaps your Lordships will permit me to say that I never for a moment desired to impute that the noble Lords opposite had said what was not true. That would have been a very foolish observation, and a most improper one. But I do adhere to what I said, that their friends in another place, and their supporters in the country, did allow charges to be made that were untrue.

On Question, agreed to *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW.

Appointed *nemine dissentiente* to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this session.

Committee for Privileges, appointed.

Committee for the Journals, appointed.

Stoppages in the Streets, order to prevent, renewed.

Appeal Committee, appointed.

ROLL OF THE LORDS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table. The same was ordered to be printed. (No. 1.)

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had received (by post) from the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland, and had laid upon the Table, minutes of the meeting held on the 30th of January last of the Peers of Scotland for the election of their representatives to sit and vote in the ensuing Parliament of the United Kingdom; and also, return by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland concerning titles of peerages called at the said meeting in right of which respectively no vote had been received and counted for fifty years last past at the date of the said meeting. Ordered, that the said minutes of election, etc., be printed. (No. 2.)

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz:—

TREATY SERIES.

No. 20 (1905). Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting Extra-territorial Jurisdiction in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 25th February, 1905. (August 29.)

No. 21 (1905). Accession of Mexico to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 13th March, 1905. (August 29.)

No. 22 (1905). Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the Junction of the Chinese and Burmese Telegraph Lines, being a revision of the Convention of 6th September, 1894. Signed at Pekin, 23rd May, 1905. (August 30.)

No. 23 (1905). Declarations between the United Kingdom and Greece with respect to Commercial Matters. Signed at Athens, 10th (23) November, 1904, and 4th (17) May, 1905. (September 2.)

No. 24 (1905). International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic. Signed at Paris, 18th May, 1904. (September 9.)

No. 25 (1905). Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905. (September 26.)

No. 26 (1905). Parcel Post Agreement between the United Kingdom and Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, 28th July, 1905. (September 29.)

No. 27 (1905). Agreement between the United Kingdom and France, relative to the Arbitral Tribunal contemplated by Article III. of the Convention of 8th April, 1904, respecting Newfoundland. Signed at London, 7th April, 1905. (October 28.)

COLONIES.

I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 454. Turks and Caicos Islands (Report for 1904). (August 19.)

No. 455. British Honduras (Report for 1904). (September 2.)

No. 456. Seychelles (Report for 1904). (September 7.)

No. 457. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast (Report for 1904). (September 8.)

No. 458. Straits Settlements (Report for 1904). (September 16.)

No. 459. Southern Nigeria (Report for 1904). (September 18.)

No. 460. Sierra Leone (Report for 1904). (September 18.)

No. 461. British Solomon Islands (Report for 1903–1904 and 1904–1905). (September 30.)

No. 462. Malta (Report for 1904–1905). (October 9.)

No. 463. Granada (Report for 1904). (October 18.)

No. 464. St. Vincent (Report for 1904). (October 13.)

No. 465. Gold Coast (Report for 1904). (October 18.)

No. 466. Barbados (Report for 1904–1905). (October 20.)

No. 467. Uganda (Report for 1904–1905). (October 31.)

No. 468. Somaliland (Report for 1904–1905). (November 3.)

No. 469. Trinidad and Tobago (Report for 1904–1905). (November 4.)

No. 470. Lagos (Report for 1904). (November 7.)

No. 471. Bahamas (Report for 1904–1905). (November 8.)

No. 472. British Central Africa Protectorate (Report for 1904 – 1905). (November 8.)

No. 473. Mauritius (Report for 1904). (November 10.)

No. 474. Fiji (Report for 1904). (November 14.)

No. 475. British East Africa Protectorate (Report for 1904–1905). (November 21.)

No. 476. Northern Nigeria (Report for 1904). (November 21.)

No. 477. British Guiana (Report for 1904–1905). (November 22.)

No. 478. Leeward Islands (Report for 1904–1905). (November 30.)

No. 479. Bechuanaland Protectorate (Report for 1904–1905). (December 2.)

No. 480. Basutoland (Report for 1904–1905). (December 15.)

II. MISCELLANEOUS.

No. 31. Northern Nigeria (Report on Cotton, Gum, and other Economic Products). (December 1.)

TRADE REPORTS.

I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3475. Portugal (Madeira).

No. 3476. Russia (Finland).

No. 3477. Turkey (Baghdad).

No. 3478. Portugal (Angola). (August 14.)

No. 3479. France (Algeria).

No. 3480. Russia (Odessa).

No. 3481. Russia (Riga). (August 18.)

No. 3482. France (Marseilles).

No. 3483. Turkey (The Hejaz). (August 19.)

No. 3484. Cuba.

No. 3485. Germany (Finances of the Kingdom of Prussia). (August 23.)

No. 3486. Austria-Hungary (Bohemia).

No. 3487. Italy (Leghorn).

No. 3488. Turkey (Tripoli). (August 25.)

No. 3489. United States (Boston).

No. 3490. Japan (Tainan). (August 26.)

No. 3491. Peru. (August 29.)

No. 3492. Tunis.

No. 3493. France (Society Islands). (August 31.)

No. 3494. Turkey (Crete).

No. 3495. Portugal (Chinde). (September 4.)

No. 3496. Italy (South Italy (Supplementary)).

No. 3497. Turkey (Hodeida and Camaran).

No. 3498. France (Réunion). (September 9.)

No. 3499. Persia (Kharassan). (September 14.)

No. 3500. Persia (Sistan and Kain). (September 10.)

No. 3501. Belgium (September 21.)

No. 3502. Japan (Yokohama), September 22.)

No. 3503. Mexico (Vera Cruz).

No. 3504. Siam (Bangkok), September 23.)

No. 3505. China (Ningpo), September 27.)

No. 3506. Germany (October 4.)

No. 3507. Persia (Azerbaijan.)

No. 3508. China (Wenchow), (October 10.)

No. 3509. France (Madagascar), (October 16.)

No. 3510. France (October 17.)

No. 3511. Würtemberg, (October 19.)

No. 3512. United States (Philippine Islands), (October 27.)

No. 3513. France (The Ivory Coast). (November 3.)

No. 3514. Trans-Caucasus (Agriculture in 1905). (November 4.)

No. 3515. Uruguay.

No. 3516. Greece. (November 7.)

No. 3517. Zanzibar.

No. 3518. Portugal (Goa.) (November 14.)

No. 3519. Germany (German Colonies.) (December 5.)

No. 3520. Switzerland. (December 7.)

No. 3521. Brazil (Santos). (January 3.)

II. MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 636. German Sea-fishing Industry and Trade. (August 19.)

No. 637. Japan (Tea Culture.)

No. 638. France (Chemical, Metal, and other Industries of Lyons). (September 4.)

No. 639. Argentine Republic (Quebracho and Cotton in the Argentine Chaco). (September 5.)

No. 640. Belgium (Scheme for the Extension of the Port of Antwerp). (September 27.)

No. 641. China (Land Taxation in the Province of Honan.) (November 17.)

No. 642. Germany (German Paper Industry and Export Trade). (November 25.)

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

1. A light railway in the rural districts of Bath and of Keynsham in the county of Somerset (being an extension of the existing and authorised undertaking of Bath Electric Tramways, Limited).

2. Light railways in the county of Devon from Newton Ferrers to Yealmptom, and from Kingsbridge to Slapton, and to Salcombe.

3. Light railways in the county of Lincoln and the West Riding of the county of York. (August 16.)

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending—

1. The Holmfield and South Owram Light Railway Order, 1902. (August 16).

2. The Central Essex Light Railway Order, 1901, and the Bardfield and Sible Hedingham Light Railway Order, 1901. (December 29).

3. Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900. (December 29.)

III. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a light railway—

1. In the county of Somerset for Priston to Dunkerton.

2. In the county borough of Devonport. (December 29.)

IV. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending—

1. The Padstow, Bednethan, and Mawgan Light Railway Order, 1903.

2. The East Sussex Light Railway Order, 1901. (December 29.)

ARMY.

I. (Estimates)—Approximate Estimate of Expenditure under Military Works Acts of 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903. (August 29.)

II. (Regulations as to Pay).—List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Treasury pursuant to the Royal Warrant dated 27th October, 1884, during the year 1904–1905. (October 14.)

III. (Military Prisons).—Report on the discipline and management of the Military Prisons, 1904. (November 11.)

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).

Forty-third Report of the Inspector, for the year 1904. (August 14.)

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1904–1905. (August 14.)

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1904–1905. (August 14.)

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND).

Thirty-seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, for the year 1904. (August 15.)

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

I. Abstracts showing the acreage under crops and the number of live stock in each county and province, 1904–1905. (August 21.)

II. Agricultural statistics of Ireland with detailed Report for the year 1904. (September 5.)

EXPLOSIVES.

I. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Major A. Cooper Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of fireworks which occurred at the factory of Messrs. John Jennison and Company at Belle Vue, near Manchester, on the 9th July, 1905. (August 24.)

II. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Captain M. B. Lloyd, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitro-glycerine, which occurred in the fitters' shop of the factory of the "Explosives and Chemical Products, Limited," at Bramble Island, Essex, on the 11th July, 1905. (October 14.)

III. Report to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending the destruction of a factory magazine at the factory of the Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, Limited, at St. Mary's Marshes, in the Hundred of Hoo, Kent, on the 29th July 1905. (November 14).

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

I. Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to inquire into and report upon the fruit industry of Great Britain; with appendices and index. (August 24).

II. Annual Report on the distribution of grants for agricultural education and research in the year 1904–1905, with statements respecting the several colleges and institutions aided, and a summary of the agricultural instruction provided by county councils in 1904–1905, and the expenditure on the same in 1903–1904 and in 1904–1905. (January 3).

WESTERN PACIFIC.

Report on the trade of the New Hebrides, by Captain Ernest Rason, R.N., Resident Deputy Commissioner. (August 19).

INDIA.

I. (Army Administration) — Further papers regarding the administration of the army in India (in continuation of [Cd. 2615.]). (August 21).

II. (Trade)—Review of the trade of India, 1904–1905. (October 11).

III. (Re-constitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam)—Further papers relating to the re-constitution of the provinces of Bengal and Assam (in continuation of [Cd. 2656.]). (October 12).

IV. (Statistical Abstract). — Statistical abstract relating to British India from 1894–1895 to 1903–1904. Thirty-ninth Number. (October 18).

V. (Sanitary Measures).—Report on sanitary measures in India in 1903–1904. Vol. XXXVII. (November 7).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act, (1871); together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade, upon certain accidents which were inquired into—

I. During the three months ended 31st March, 1905. (August 30).

II. During the three months ended 30th June, 1905. (October 11).

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).

Annual Report for the year 1904–1905. (September 2.)

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1905. (September 5.)

POLICE (METROPOLIS).

Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, for the year 1904. (September 7).

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1904. (September 8).

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

I. (Reports on Children under Five Years of Age). Reports on children under five years of age in public elementary schools by women inspectors of the Board of Education. (September 8).

II. (Administrative County of Stafford. Endowed Charities (Elementary Education).) Report made to the Board of Education on the result of any inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the administrative county of Stafford, or in any part thereof. (September 16).

III. Regulations relating to the Royal College of Science, the Royal College of Art, and to Museums under the Board of Education, from 1st August, 1905, to 31st July, 1906. (October 10).

IV. (Statistics of Public Education, 1903, 1904, 1905). Statistics of public education in England and Wales, 1903, 1904, 1905. (November 21).

V. Report to the Board of Education for the year 1904–1905. (November 23).

VI. Inter-departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools.

Vol. 1. Report and Appendices. (November 13).

Vol. II. List of Witnesses, Minutes of Evidence, Appendices and Index. (November 27).

VII. Report from University Colleges, 1905. (November 30).

VIII. (List of Evening Schools). List of evening schools under the administration of the Board, for the school year, 1903–1904). (December 18).

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

I. (Proceedings). 1. Return of Proceedings during July, 1905. (September 16).

2. Return of Proceedings during August, 1905. (September 20).

3. Return of Proceedings during September, 1905. (November 8).

II. (Estates Commissioners). Report of Proceedings for the period from 1st November, 1903 to 31st March, 1905. (September 27).

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).

Forty-eighth Report, for the year 1904, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools; Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI. (September 18).

CANADA (IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN CATTLE INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Despatch from the Governor-General of Canada, with the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. (September 19).

BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

Report on the working of the Uganda railway and the steamboat service on Lake Victoria, 1904–1905. (September 21).

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and inland fisheries of Ireland for the year 1904; Part I. General Report. (September 22).

MINES AND QUARRIES.

I. (General Report and Statistics for 1904; Part II. Labour). General report and statistics relating to persons employed and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, and to the enforcement of the Mines and Quarries Acts. (September 23).

II. (General Report and Statistics for 1904; Part III. Output). General report and statistics relating to the output and value of the minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of minerals. (October 3).

III. (National Colliery Explosion). Reports to His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department by E. Milner Jones, Barrister-at-Law, and by F. A. Gray and J. T. Robson, two of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending the explosion which occurred at the National Colliery, Wattstowon on the 11th July 1905. (November 11).

JAPAN, NO. 2 (1905).

Despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburgh, forwarding a copy of the Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August 1905. (September 6).

POOR LAW COMMISSIONERS' REPORT OF 1834.

Report made in 1834 by the Commissioners for Inquiry into the administration and practical operation of the Poor Laws. (September 12).

MUSCAT, NO. 1 (1905).

Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to decide on the question of the grant of the French Flag to Muscat dhows. September 28).

FRANCE, NO. 1 (1905).

Agreement between His Majesty's Government and the French Government for the constitution of an Arbitral Tribunal to settle the indemnity to be awarded to the French citizens lately engaged in the fishery on the treaty shore of Newfoundland, and statement of sums allotted by the arbitrators. (September 28.)

MISCELLANEOUS, NO. 4 (1905).

Agreements between the Argentine Republic and the Republic of Chile. Signed on 28th May 1902, 10th July 1902, and 9th January 1903. (October 13.)

AFRICA, NO. 6. (1905)

Reports relating to the administration of the East Africa Protectorate. (October 28).

TURKEY, NO. 3 (1905).

Further correspondence respecting the affairs of South-Eastern Europe. (In continuation of Turkey, No. 2, 1905). (November 28).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Correspondence relating to the future organization of Colonial Conferences. (December 1).

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (LAUNDRIES).

List of religious and charitable institutions in which laundries are carried on. (Second Issue.) (September 26).

CYPRUS.

I. Report by Professor Wyndham Dunstan, F.R.S., on the agricultural resources of Cyprus, with special reference to cotton cultivation and correspondence relating thereto. (September 28).

II. Annual Report for 1904–1905. (November 17).

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Statistics for June 1905. (October 10).

LONDON TRAFFIC (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire and report on the means of locomotion and traffic in London.

Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence.

Vol. III. Appendices. (October 14).

Vols. V. and Vol. VI. Maps and Diagrams, with Index. (December 29).

Vol. VII. and Vol. VIII. Report to the Royal Commission on London Traffic by the Advisory Board of Engineers, and Appendix. (October 2).

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1869.

Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland, for the year 1904. (October 20).

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September 1905. (October 21).

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND).

Report of the Board for the year ended 31st March 1905. (October 26).

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September 1905. (October 30).

IRISH TEACHERS' PENSION RULES.

Rules under section 11 of the National School Teachers' (Ireland) Act, 1879. (November 1).

SWITZERLAND (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF INTERIM STATEMENT)).

Translation of the New "General" Customs Tariff of Switzerland, as modified by the New Commercial Treaties concluded with Germany and Italy. (November 8).

BOND INVESTMENT COMPANIES COMMITTEE.

I. Report of the Departmental Committee on Bond Investment Companies.

II. Appendices to the Report. (November 8).

LUNACY (IRELAND).

Fifty-fourth Report (with Appendices) of the Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland), for the year ended 31st December 1904. (November 9).

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Return in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of March, 1905, on Duty on the Railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time, or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours rest. (November 20).

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)

Section I. Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1904.

Section II. Inspectors, training colleges, schools in operation, etc.

Section III. Examination papers set at the annual examinations, 1904; Summary of the answering. (November 10).

WEST INDIES.

West Indian Inter-colonial Sanitary Convention, 1904, adopted by legislation in Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and the Leeward Islands. (November 13)

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1904. (November 18).

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).

I. Supplement to the Forty-eighth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1902). (November 30).

II. Forty-ninth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1903.) (December 12).

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.

Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works (in continuation of [Cd. 2279.]) (December 7.)

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Report for the year 1905, by J. Struthers, Esq., C.B., LL.D. (December 7).

NAVY.

I. (Admiralty Policy).—A statement of Admiralty policy. (December 9).

II. (Gunnery).—Result of test of gun-layers with heavy guns in His Majesty's fleet, 1905. (December 12).

INEBRIATE RETREATS (IRELAND).

First report, with appendices, of the Inspector for Ireland for the years 1903–1904. (December 18).

FOREIGN IMPORT DUTIES, 1905.

Statement of the rates of import duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Japan, China, and Persia, upon produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom. (December 20).

COMMERCIAL.

No. 4. (1905).—Further reports from His Majesty's Representatives on navigable inland waterways in Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. (December 22).

No. 5. (1905).—Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Bucharest, transmitting the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and Roumania, signed on 31st October, 1905. (December 30).

No. 1. (1906).—Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Sofia, transmitting the commercial convention between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria, signed 9th December 1905. (January 8).

No. 2. (1906)—Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Havana, transmitting the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and Cuba, signed at Havana, 4th May 1905. (January 8).

NIGERIA.

Correspondence relating to railway construction in Nigeria. (December 29).

ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION 1904 (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of His Majesty's Commissioners for the International Exhibition at St. Louis, 1904. (December 29).

CHINA, NO. 2 1905).

Report by Mr. Walter J. Clennell, His Majesty's Consul at Kingkiang, on a journey in the interior of Kiangsi. (With a map). (December 30).

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (ELECTORS, ETC.,), (UNITED KINGDOM).

Return showing, with regard to each parliamentary constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number, and as far as possible the number in each class of the electors on the register now in force, and also showing the population and inhabited houses in each constituency. (January 2.)

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT, 1903.

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Chester Jones, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, on the byelaws made by the London County Council under the Employment of Children Act, 1903. (January 5.)

TRANSVAAL.

I. Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines (in continuation of [Cd. 2401.], April, 1905, and [Cd. 2563], July 1905). (December 1.)

II. Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines (in continuation of [Cd. 2786.], December, 1905). (January 8.)

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

I. Reports on the manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., preserved at Dropmore, Vol. V., and of the Earl of Verulam, preserved at Gorhambury. (January 8.)

II. Calendar of Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells. Vol. I. (January 8.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY.

(Estimates)—Estimates for the year 1906–1907, with explanation of differences.

Statement of First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1906–1907.

(Battle Practice)—Result of battle practice in His Majesty's fleet, 1905.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Report for the year 1905, by the Director, on the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh.

TRANSVAAL.

Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines.

TREATY SERIES, NO. 1 (1906).

Agreement additional to the Money Order Convention of 8th December, 1882, between the United Kingdom and France signed at Paris, 20th April 1904. (Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January 1906.)

COMMERCIAL, NO. 3 (1906).

International Sugar Commission, Autumn Session, 1905; Report of proceedings (in continuation of Commercial No. 3. (1905.)

ROUMANIA (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF (INTERIM STATEMENT)).

Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by Commercial Treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany.

CANCER RESEARCH (COLONIES).

Further correspondence relating to the Cancer Research Scheme (in continuation of [Cd. 2342], February 1905).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the Three Months ended 30th September, 1905, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871), together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into.

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.

Return of the numbers and nationalities of the passengers that left the United Kingdom for places out of Europe in each month of the Year 1906, distinguishing the principal countries in which the passengers contracted to land.

TRADE DISPUTES AND TRADE COMBINATIONS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the subject of trade disputes and trade combinations, and as to the law affecting them.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

1. Return for the month of October, 1905.)

2. Return for the Month of November, 1905.

3. Return for the month of December, 1905.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st December, 1905.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st December, 1905.

METEOROLOGY.

Report of the Meteorological Council to the President and Council of the Royal Society, for the year ended 31st March, 1905.

TRADE UNIONS (BOARD OF TRADE LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

Report by the chief labour correspondent of the Board of Trade on trade unions in 1902–1904, with comparative statistics for 1895–1904.

WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED SEAMEN.

Account of the sums received and paid in respect of the wages and effects of deceased seamen in the year ended 31st March, 1905.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903 (REGULATIONS).

Regulations made by the Lord Lieutenant in pursuance of the provisions of Section 23 (8) of the Act.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Comparative statement of pauperism and cost of the relief of the poor in certain years from 1848–49 to 1904–1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table

LUNACY.

1. Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics between 1st April, 1905, and 30th September, 1905.

2. Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, and the number of patients seen, by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended 31st December, 1905.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Draft Order in Council, continuing certain provisions in the Order in Council of 6th March, 1902.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

1. (Collisions at Sea)—Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, amending Article 10 of the regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of the 11th August, 1880, for preventing collisions at sea.

2. Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, approving certain new pilotage byelaws made by the Pilotage Board of Port Talbot.

3. Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, revoking a proviso in paragraph 24 of the regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 24th March, 1902, relating to the registry of British sea-fishing boats.

COLONIAL PROBATES ACT, 1892.

Order in Council, dated 23rd October, 1905, applying the Colonial Probates Act, 1892, to the Orange River Colony.

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.

Order in Council, dated 20th Novermber, 1905, approving a scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for transferring to the Newcastle Chapter Endowment Fund the endowment of a canonry in the Cathedral Church of Durham.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACT, 1866.

Order in Council, dated 20th November, 1905, amending the Order in Council of 20th March, 1877, applying to day industrial schools the provisions of the Industrial Schools Acts, and revoking the previous amending Order of 11th July, 1905.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSION ACT, 1865.

Order in Council, dated 20th November, 1905, approving a memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to a rule by which retired pay and pension, except pensions for wounds of commissioned, commissioned warrant, and warrant officers, shall be held only during good behaviour, and may be forfeited or suspended for misconduct or restored at the discretion of the Admiralty.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1858 (INDIA OFFICE).

Order in Council, dated 11th December, 1905, approving a statement of new and revised appointments and alterations of salaries in the establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890 (ORDERS IN COUNCIL).

1. Dated 11th December, 1905, entitled "the Brunei Order in Council, 1905";

2. Dated 8th January, 1906, entitled "the Somaliland Order in Councils 1906";

3. Dated 8th January, 1906, making provision for a Seal for His Britannic Majesty's Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa.

INDIA.

1. (Examinations) Revision of paragraph 8 of the regulations for the admission of candidates to the civil service of India;

2. (Loans raised in India). Return of all loans raised in India chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 30th September, 1905, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half-year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year, stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year;

3. (Loans raised in England)—Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament, chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 30th September, 1905, with the rates of interest, and total amount payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year, the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half-year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year, stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

I. Orders made by the councils of the following counties, boroughs, county boroughs, metropolitan boroughs, and urban districts, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing certain shops in the :—

1. County borough of Bury.
2. Borough of Barrow-in-Furness.
3. County borough of St. Helens.
4. Borough of Swindon.
5. Metropolitan borough of Deptford.
6. Metropolitan borough of Greenwich.
7. Borough of Leicester.
8. County borough of Stockport.
9. Borough of Ashton-under-Lyne.
10. County borough of Halifax.
11. County borough of Birkenhead.
12. Borough of Accrington.
13. County borough of Cardiff.
14. County borough of Middlesborough.
15. Urban district of Shipley.
16. Urban district of Pontypridd.
17. Borough of Stafford.
18. Borough of Wolverhampton.
19. County of Lancaster, within the following urban districts—
    1. Atherton (Hindsford).
    2. Levenshulme.
    3. Padiham.
    4. Tyldesley-with-Shakerley.
    5. Great Harwood.
    6. Clayton - le - Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church (part of).
    7. Rishton.
    8. Church (part of).

20. County of Monmouth, within the urban districts of Blaenavon, Abersychan, Pontypool, Panteg, Llanvrechva Upper, and Llantarnam.

21. Metropolitan borough of Battersea.

22. Metropolitan borough of Southwark.

23. Metropolitan borough of Camberwell.

24. Corporation of the borough of Barnsley.

25. Corporation of the borough of Newport.

26. Corporation of the borough of Darwen.

27. Council of the county borough of Grimsby.

28. Council of the borough of Swansea.

29. County borough of Salford.

30. County borough of Rochdale.

31. County borough of Oldham.

II. Closing Orders made by the urban district councils of—

1. Limavady.
2. Portadown.
3. Ballymena.
4. Banbridge.
5. Coleraine.
6. Ballymoney.

III. Orders by the Secretary for Scotland providing for the early closing of certain shops in—

1 and 2. The burgh of Motherwell.
3. The burgh of Clydebank.
4. The city of Glasgow.
5. The burgh of Kinning Park.
6. The burgh of Partick.
7. The burgh of Govan.
8. The burgh of Dundee.
9. The burgh of Paisley.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCES).

Licences granted by His Majesty to—

1. John Bond, (2) George Lamb, (3) Marion Seddon, (4) William Grant, (5) Robert Allen, under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A. of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864.

2. Ada Brown, a convict under detention in Aylesbury prison permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Home of Compassion, Pimlico, S.W.

3. Sarah Craddock, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the London Female Preventive and Reformatory Institution, Holloway, N.

4. Margaret Hartley, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the East End Refuge, Finchley, N.

POLLING DISTRICTS.

Orders made by the—

1. County council of the county of Southampton constituting the parish of Grayshott a separate polling district in the Petersfield parliamentary division.

2. County council of the county of Stafford constituting the parish of Quarry Bank a separate polling district in the Kingswinford division of the county for the purposes of parliamentary elections.

3. County council of the county of Surrey altering certain polling districts within the county (3 orders).

4. Justices of the Kensington Petty Sessional Division dividing the Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea into polling districts.

5. County council of the county of Southampton constituting the Blackmoor Ward of the parish of Selborne a separate polling district in the Petersfield parliamentary division of the county.

6. County council of the county of Dorset dividing the parish of Corfe Mullen into polling districts.

7. Council of the borough of Birkenhead altering one of the polling districts in the borough.

8. County council of the county of Southampton altering certain polling districts in the New Forest parliamentary division of the county.

9. County council of the county of Lancaster re-dividing the Ormskirk, Prestwich, and Stretford parliamentary divisions into convenient polling districts.

10. County council of the county of Essex altering certain polling districts in the Romford parliamentary division.

11. County council of the county of Huntingdon altering certain polling districts in the northern parliamentary division of the county.

12. County council of the council of Durham altering certain polling districts in the Bishop Auckland and mid-parliamentary divisions of the county.

LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS ACT, 1896, MOTOR CAR ACT, 1903.

Orders by the Secretary for Scotland prohibiting motor car traffic on certain highways in the counties of—

1. Haddington (dated 31st October, 1905).

2. Forfar (dated 3rd January, 1906).

3. Argyll (district of Ardnamurchan) (dated 15th November, 1905).

4. Argyll (district of the island of Mull). dated 31st October, 1905).

5. Bute (district of the island of Arran) (dated 31st October, 1905).

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Regulations, dated 14th November, 1905, made by the Local Government Board for Scotland under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Section 4 (3), respecting organisation for unemployed.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Act of Adjowmal for regulating the procedure in Scotland under the Aliens Act, 1905.

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).

Four Orders in Council, dated 4th November, 1905, for holding winter assizes in Ireland.

GENERAL PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Order closing the female prison at Limerick.

PHARMACY (IRELAND) ACTS, 1875 TO 1890, ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

1. Dated 4th November, 1905, approving of Regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society.

2. Dated 7th February, 1906, approving of an amended regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society.

MILITIA ACT, 1882 (DEPUTY LIEUTENANTS).

Returns of descriptions of qualifications of Deputy Lieutenants lodged during 1905, as furnished to the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

I. Orders with respect to the urban county districts of—

1. Bangor.
2. Monaghan.
3. Carrickmacross.

II. Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed), Ireland, 1905.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).

Regulations for the appointment of members of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

I. Time table of examinations for the year 1906.

II. Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland—

1. Amending Rule 42 (iv) (I) (6), and Rule 45 of the rules for 1906.

2. Substituting a work in the middle grade honours programme in Irish, 1906, for that originally prescribed.

3. Prescribing an alternative work in the middle grade pass programme in French for 1906.

III. Rule made identifying the syllabuses of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the purposes of the rules of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1906.

IV. Rules and programme of examinations for 1906.

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACT, 1904. (REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS).

Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 1 of the Secretary for Scotland Act, 1904, as to the transfer to the Secretary for Scotland of certain powers and duties in connection with reformatories and industrial schools.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION (CAPITAL AND INCOME ACCOUNTS, 1904–1905).

Accounts of the receipt and expenditure of the capital and of the income derived from the lands and other property held for the benefit of Greenwich Hospital, and the Foundation of Samuel Travers, Esquire for the year ended 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

RAMSGATE HARBOUR.

Statement of the receipts and payments made by the Board of Trade, for the year ended 31st March, 1905; together with an account of the receipt and issue of stores.

LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES.

Statements of accounts and of life assurance and annuity business and abstracts of actuarial reports deposited with the Board of Trade under Section 10 of "the Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870," during the year ended 31st December, 1905.

GENERAL LIGHTHOUSE FUND.

An account of the General Lighthouse Fund showing income and expenditure for year ended 31st March, 1905.

WEST HIGHLAND RAILWAY (EXTENSION FROM BANAVIE TO MALLAIG).

Fourth Annual Report by the Board of Trade as to the condition and working of the Banavie to Mallaig Railway, the rates and charges for traffic, and the receipts and expenditure of any company in working the railway, for the year 1904–1905.

COMMITTALS (IRELAND).

Returns from the Clerks of the Crown and Peace of the numbers of persons committed for trial in 1905.

POST OFFICE (STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905).

1. No. 1065. (Telegraphs)—The Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1905. Dated 1st September, 1905.

2. No. 1328. (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Costa Rica)—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 18) Warrant, 1905. Dated 21st December, 1905.

3. No. 951. (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Madeira)—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 16) Warrant, 1905. Dated 12th August, 1905.

4. No. 1366. (Inland Post)—The Inland Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1905. Dated 28th December, 1905.

SAVINGS BANKS (INVESTMENT) REGULATIONS.

Draft Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations, 1906.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Treasury Minute, dated 14th February, 1906, authorising the lease of a plot of land at the Dalkey end of the disused tramway from Kingstown to Dalkey.

DUCHY OF CORNWALL.

Account of the receipts and disbursements of the Duchy of Cornwall in the year ended 31st December, 1905.

SUPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury Minutes granting under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887, retired allowances to—

Reginald P. Tibbs, deputy cashier in charge, Royal Victoria Yard Deptford (27th November, 1905); J. W. Metcalfe and W. F. Ridsdale, sorting clerks and telegraphists; R. L. Frost, 1st class clerk, Money Order Office; and W. B. Crane, overseer and junior telegraphist, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office (23rd November, 1905); Charles Bennett, 1st class assistant architect and surveyor, Office of Works (31st October, 1905).

II. Treasury Minutes declaring that the following persons were appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their departments—

Harry Mott, postmaster, Cowes (23rd October, 1905); William Fretton, Bridewell, keeper at New Ross, Bridewell, Irish Prison Service (8th January, 1906); Thomas Moodie, engineer in charge of pumping machinery, Dover, War Office (22nd January, 1906); William Chevalier, clerk, His Majesty's

Consulate, Alexandria; Giovanni Fabri, assistant clerk, His Majesty's Consulate, Alexandria; Saverio Inglott, shipping clerk, His Majesty's Consulate, Alexandria; Shukvallah Fathalla Huri, dragoman, His Majesty's Consular Service, Alexandria, Consular Service (9th December, 1905).

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.

Treasury Minute declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Treasury Solicitor in Ireland professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required (12th January, 1906).

IMPERIAL OTTOMAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1855).

Account for the year to 31st December, 1905, prepared under the Act, showing the sums issued and applied for interest as guaranteed by Her late Majesty, and for management of the Imperial Ottoman Guaranteed Loan of 1855, and also of the repayment in respect of advances under the said Act.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 25th October, 1905, which have been written off.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1860 TO 1904.

Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a visiting Committee to the prison at Glasgow (Duke Street).

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Glasgow to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Act, for the year 1904–1905.

Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1904–1905.

Annual Report on the state of the finances of the University of Edinburgh under the provisions of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1904–1905.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

I. (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries).

Regulations, dated 17th October, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, in respect of the process of spinning by self-acting mules.

Regulations, dated 12th December, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act 1901, for the processes of sorting, willeying, washing, combing, and carding wool, goats hair, and camel hair, and processes incidental thereto.

II. Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 15th August, 1905, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act. 1901.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Proclamation, dated 6th February, 1906, revoking the several proclamations mentioned in the schedule thereto.

PICKLE POINT PIER, COUNTY MAYO.

Rules and Regulations.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Order, dated 12th September, 1905, entitled the Hull (Channel Islands, Animals) Landing-place Revocation Order of 1905.

Order, dated 11th October, 1905, entitled the Manchester (Old Trafford) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1905.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of Merton College, Oxford, on the 18th March, 1904, amending Statutes III. and IV. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 3.)

Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on the 23rd November, 1904, amending Statute IV. and Schedule B. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 4.)

3. Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on the 11th March, 1905, to amend the Ordinance regulating the Radcliffe Travelling Fellowships. (No. 5.)

Statutes made by the Governing Body of New College, Oxford, on the 21st June, 1905, in lieu of Statutes IV. and XIV. of the Statutes of the College. (No. 6.)

5. Statutes made by the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford, on the 29th June, 1905, altering Statutes XI., XVI., and XVIII. of the Statutes of the House. (No. 7.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889. UNIVERSITY COURT ORDINANCES.

No. XI. (Edinburgh No. 4)—Institution of degrees in veterinary medicine and surgery, and relative regulations). (No. 8.)

No. XII. (Edinburgh No. 5)—Inclusion of geography among the subjects qualifying for graduation in arts. (No. 9.)

No. XIII. (General No. 1)—Ordinance of the University Courts of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh. (No. 10.)

General No. 1. (Regulations for Degrees in Arts)—Supplementary to Ordinance No. 11. (No. 11.)

General No. 6. Of the Universities Commissioners. (No. 12.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed.

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.

Scheme for effecting the union of two contiguous benefices situate within the Metropolis, and within the diocese of London, namely, the benefice (being a vicarage) of St. Mary Charterhouse and the benefice (being a vicarage) of St. Thomas Charterhouse, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. (No. 13.)

Scheme for effecting the union of two contiguous benefices situate within the Metropolis and within the city and diocese of London, namely, the benefice (being a rectory) of Saint Michael Cornhill, and the benefice (being a rectory) of Saint Peter Le Poor, with the vicarage of Saint Benet Fink annexed, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. (No. 14.)

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed.

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR COMPANY (1812).

Report and statement of accounts for the year ended 5th April, 1905.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD.

Accounts for the year ended 1st July, 1905.

Delivered (according to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Moved, That Standing Order No. 92 be considered in order to its being suspended, and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills which expires this day, be extended till To-morrow.—(The Chairman of Committees); agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 19th February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.

Message to attend His Majesty.

The House went.

And, being returned.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW WRIT FOR THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE(WESTERN OR WESTBURY, DIVISION).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Wiltshire (Western or Westbury Division), in the room of John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, who, since his election for the said County, hath accepted the Office of one of the Commissioners for executing the Office of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland."—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I rise for the purpose of moving that the debate be adjourned in order to raise a question of considerable constitutional and personal interest. The Motion is that a new writ should be issued on the ground of the appointment of the gentleman named to an office of profit, viz., one of the Commissionerships of the Treasury. But, as a matter of fact, the office concerned is not an office of profit. There is no pay of any kind attached to it; and, consequently, I maintain that the seat is not vacated; that Mr. Fuller is still a Member of the House, and that it is out of order to move for a new writ. It is urged, I know, that though not now an office of profit, this office has been such in times past, or on certain occasions was assumed to be. An illustration has been given us in the shape of the action of the House in regard to the appointment to the Chiltern Hundreds and other similar offices. The House no doubt knows that by its constitution no Member elected to it can relinquish his seat, and in order that he may be able to resign if he wishes to do so, he is presented with an office, and then, under the constitution, which requires anyone accepting an office of profit under the Crown to vacate his seat, he is allowed to resign and a writ is moved for. The great authority on these questions is the work of Sir Erskine May, which states, with regard to the Chiltern Hundreds and other similar offices—

> "These offices, indeed, are merely nominal; but as the warrants of appointment grant them together with all wages, fees, allowances, etc., they assume the form of offices of profit."

It is a convenient assumption of something which is not the fact; because although these offices do carry with them all such fees and wages as may pertain to them, as a matter of fact no wages or fees do so pertain and the pecuniary advantage is only imaginary. Still, it has always been held that the fact that on the warrant fees and wages are referred to justifies the House in accepting the appointment as one of profit. I wish to call attention in the first place to the very clear distinction between the office of profit so described on the warrant and the office to which Mr. Fuller has been appointed. If we turn to Sir William Anson's book on the Law of the Constitution it appears that the Letters Patent which are issued for the Commissioners of the Treasury contain no corresponding phrase. There is no allusion in the Letters Patent to any fees or any pecuniary advantage whatsoever, and there is therefore no pretence for saying in the case of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury that we may assume, as in the case of a gentleman appointed to the Chiltern Hundreds, that he has been appointed to a place of profit. My contention, therefore, is that in the case of the present Motion there is no vacancy, that the hon. Gentleman cannot relinquish his office, and accordingly I move that the debate be adjourned. But that is not the only point at issue. There is not merely a great constitutional point; there is also a personal point. This hon. Gentleman succeeded to an office previously held by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Newington, who was appointed in like manner before the general election to the office of unpaid Lord of the Treasury. Now he has been appointed to a paid lordship, and for the first time he has assumed an office which is undoubtedly one of profit. The House will see that if the contention of the mover of this Motion is correct, and if the office to which the hon. Member for West Wiltshire has been appointed is an office of profit, then it is merely a transfer which has taken place. But if my differing contention is right, and the office to which the hon. Member for West Wiltshire has been appointed is not a paid office, then the only appointment with which the House has to deal is the appointment of the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington.

It is the latter whose seat is vacant and not that of the hon. Member for the Western Division of Wiltshire. There are several other precedents to which I must refer. There is the case of the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. It has been held that that is an office of profit, although I believe that there also no money passes, and the holder of the office gains no pecuniary advantage by reason of his appointment. But in the case of the office of the Lord Warden there occur words in the warrant which allow it to be assumed to be an office of profit. The warrant says that the occupant is granted all wrecks, and all fees, rewards, commodities, emoluments, profits, perquisites and other advantages. On that ground, and although as I say these advantages are really unreal, it is assumed to be an office of profit. In 1881 there was the case of the appointment of the present Home Secretary to a similar office to that now in question, but although Sir Erskine May said that the seat was vacated, he did not refer to any debate in the House or any opinion given on the subject. I am bound to point out that that is a case precisely in point, and if it were illegal then the fact that it was done by common consent and without opposition does not make it a sufficient precedent for the present case, neither does it justify it. There is another case, even more in point, the case of the late Mr. King Harman, who, in 1887, was appointed Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. That also was an unpaid office, and on that occasion it was held that the seat was not vacated and no fresh election took place. I consider that to be a case precisely in point, and I must say that unless we take a common sense view we really are placed in a ridiculous position, because if the hon. Member for West Wiltshire is still a Member, and if under the circumstances the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington has to vacate his seat, the latter, unless he does so, will render himself liable on the information of any person to a fine of a very considerable amount—I believe £500—every time he takes his seat or participates in a division. If my contention is right, the hon. and gallant Member is not entitled to vote in this House, and the hon. Member for West Wiltshire is not entitled to resign. In such cases as these, raising questions of law, it has been the universal practice, a precedent which I hope the Prime Minister will follow, to allow the debate to be adjourned and to appoint a Committee to examine into precedents. I move accordingly.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. J. Chamberlain.*)

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir J. LAWSON WALTON, Leeds, S.): Notwithstanding the ingenious and forensic argument of the right hon. Gentleman, I think my hon. and gallant friend the Member for West Newington need have no qualms, and can take his seat and vote without being under any apprehension. The right hon. Gentleman has not fully stated the important constitutional question which arises for consideration in this case. The question is not whether Mr. Fuller has or has not assented to make no application for a salary, or whether or not it is proposed to ask Parliament to vote him a salary; but whether the office which has been conferred upon him is within the contemplation of the series of statutes applicable to the case an office of profit under the Crown. There are no less than four Acts of Parliament which deal with the Commissioners of the Treasury, or Lords of the Treasury, as they are popularly called. There is the Act of William III., which disqualified servants of the Crown from sitting in this House, but created an exception in favour of the Commissioners of the Treasury then in being, clearly, therefore, contemplating that Members who held that office were by reason of their tenure of it disqualified from serving in Parliament. Then in the time of Queen Anne came a statute by which re-election was imposed on any Member who took an office of profit under the Crown, and there was a distinct restriction against any increase in the number of the Commissioners of the Treasury, again treating the office as one of profit under the Crown. In another statute power was given to enlarge the number of Commissioners by two. Lastly, and I submit conclusively, there is the statute of 1867, which contains a schedule entitled "Offices of profit under the Crown," and among those offices stands that of Commissioner of the Treasury. In view of these considerations it is very difficult to say that an office of that character has not been conferred upon Mr. Fuller. It is impossible to say that because Mr. Fuller has agreed to accept the office without remuneration, or because it is not proposed to ask Parliament to vote him any remuneration, therefore the office itself does not come under the contemplation of these statutes. There is, further, the precisely analogous case of my right hon. friend the Home Secretary in 1881, in which those eminent authorities Lord James of Hereford and the late Lord Herschell gave exactly the same opinion as that at which the present law officers have arrived, and as a result of that opinion a writ was issued for the re-election of my right hon. friend by the then Speaker. I submit that the precedent thus created, with the eminent authorities which I have quoted, decide the present case against the contentions and criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman poposite.

SIR EDWARD CARSON (Dublin University) said this was not a question of a political nature. It was one which might concern a Member of either Party. But it was of importance in view of the position of the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington, that the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington when he went to his constituents at the general election held an office which brought him no profit from the Crown. Now, however, the hon. Member held an office which brought him profit. This question of re-election had never arisen upon an exactly similar case.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am a precedent myself. During the last six months of the Government of 1885 I drew pay as a Junior Lord of the Treasury.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he did not think that that was a precedent, because the present Home Secretary's case was never brought before the House. There was no case, so far as he knew, in which the House had determined that an hon. Member who held an unpaid office did not have to go again to his constituents when pay was attached. If the House that afternoon created a precedent it would be going against the whole spirit of the statutes dealing with the necessity of re-election. There had been many cases since he had held a seat in this House where a Member had been appointed to an office without a re-election being deemed necessary. There was the case of Mr. Darling—now Mr. Justice Darling—who was sent out as a Commissioner of Assize. Pay usually attached to that office, but Mr. Darling arranged to take no salary, and, in consequence of that it was held that no writ was necessary. That was precisely an analagous case to this. The point to be borne in mind was that the hon. Member for West Newington when elected held an office to which no profit was attached. Since his election he had been presented to a salaried office. Was the House going to lay it down that his case did not come within the Act of Parliament which provided that Members accepting offices of profit should vacate their seats. The case being a new one, the proper way to determine it was, he submitted, not by a vote of the House, but by the appointment of a Committee.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) submitted that in dealing with Mr. Fuller's case, the point to be decided was not whether any particular Member was or was not going to derive profit, but what the office itself was. The earlier statutes treated the office as being one of profit because they imposed limitations on the number of such offices that could be created. It would be a somewhat novel thing in English legislation to find the Legislature anxious to impose limitations on the number of offices with no profit. The Legislature did not mind how many such offices were created, but the moment a salary was attached then the limitation applied. The present office of Mr. Fuller was described as an "office of profit," and it would be impossible for the law officers of the Crown to treat it otherwise than in the way now proposed.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Wilts (Western or Westbury Division) in the room of John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, who, since his election for the said county, hath accepted the Office of one of the Commissioners for executing the Office of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the City of London, in the room of the hon. Alban George Henry Gibbs (Manor of Northstead).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

ELECTIONS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their Election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if anything shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate; and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

Mr. Joseph Devlin, returned as Member for West Belfast and North Kilkenny, stated that he elected to sit for West Belfast.

Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, returned as a Member for North Sligo and North Leitrim, stated that he elected to sit for North Sligo.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) rose to submit a question of privilege and to move that Lord Atkinson had, by voting at the recent election in the St. Stephen's Green Division of Dublin, been guilty of a breach of the privileges of the House. The case, he said, was a peculiarly aggravated one. Lord Atkinson had been for fifteen years a Member of the House of Commons, and, as a Law Officer of the late Government, had again and again voted for this sessional order. It could not, therefore, be said that he acted in ignorance when, having been made a Law Lord, he presented himself at the polling booth at the last election and—voted for the Conservative candidate he supposed. He based that supposition upon his knowledge of Lord Atkinson's record. The case was further aggravated by the fact that Lord Atkinson was not merely a peer; he had been appointed a Law Lord and he ought to have known enough of the spirit of the profession to which he belonged to be aware that it was peculiarly improper for him to vote in the election of a Member of Parliament. A case came before the Law Courts in 1858 as to the rights of peers to take part in elections, and Lord Campbell laid it down that a peer under the common law of England had no right to vote in the election of a Member of the House of Commons. Again when the late Lord Salisbury and another peer appealed against their names being struck off the register of voters, their appeal was dismissed on the same ground, yet in face of these decisions, which must have been within his knowledge, Lord Atkinson went into a polling booth at Dublin and presumably recorded his vote.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Lord Atkinson, a Peer of Parliament, has, by his action in voting at the recent Election in the St. Stephen's Green Division of the City of Dublin, been guilty of a breach of the Privileges of this House."—(*Mr. Dillon*).

Mr. **Speaker** stated that he had received a letter from Lord Atkinson, which he read to the House, as follows—

19th February, 1906.

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

"From what I have seen in the newspaper I think it possible that some question may be raised as to my having voted at the last Election for the St. Stephen's Green Division of the City of Dublin. At the time I voted I did not think that any question could be raised as to my right to exercise the franchise, since my Patent had not then been delivered to me, nor had I received any summons to the House of Lords. Since my attention has, however, been called to the matter, I think I may have offended against the spirit of the Resolution of the House of Commons if not the letter. I therefore regret having voted, and beg through you to apologise to the House if I have unwillingly in any way invaded its privileges.

"Believe me,
"Yours sincerely,
"ATKINSON."

MR. DILLON said that in view of that apology from Lord Atkinson he would not put the House to the trouble of a division, but in asking leave to withdraw his Motion he desired to say that in his judgment Lord Atkinson offended not only against the spirit but also against the letter of the Order.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ELECTIONS.

Resolved, That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to serve for the Commons in Parliament, concern himself in the Election of Members except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament.

MR. DILLON said he had always joined the late Mr. J. Lowther in opposing this order. He desired again to enter his protest against it, but would not trouble the House to divide. No doubt hon. Members were anxious to get to the business of what was likely to prove an exceptionally interesting session, and inasmuch as many new Members of this House had not had an opportunity of inquiry into the merits or demerits of this particular order he would endeavour between now and another session to convert them to the view held by many of the old Members of the House who were opposed to it.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery or other corrupt practices.

WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime or misdemeanour; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the Sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

OUTLAWRIES BILL.

"For the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

JOURNAL.

Ordered, That the Journal of this House, from the end of the last Session to the end of the present Session, with an Index thereto, be printed.

Ordered, That 500 Copies of the said Journal and Index be printed by the appointment and under the direction of Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., the Clerk of this House.

Ordered, That the said Journal and Index be printed by such person as shall be licensed by Mr. Speaker, and that no other person do presume to print the same.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by His Majesty's Command during the Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Explosions (Messrs. John Jennison and Company's Factory at Belle Vue, near Manchester). Copy of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Fireworks which occurred at the Factory of Messrs. John Jennison and Co., at Belle Vue, near Manchester, on the 9th July, 1905.

2. Explosions (Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, St. Mary's Marshes). Copy of Report by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending the Destruction of a Factory Magazine at the Factory of the Thames Storage (Explosives) Company, Limited, at St. Mary's Marshes, in the Hundred of Hoo, Kent, on the 29th July, 1905.

3. Explosions (National Colliery, Wattstown). Copy of Reports by E. Milner-Jones, Barrister-at-Law, and F. A. Gray and J. T. Robson, two of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which occurred at the National Colliery, Wattstown, on the 11th July, 1905.

4. Explosions (Bramble Island, Essex). Copy of Report by Captain M. B. Lloyd, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Nitro-Glycerine which occurred in the fitters' shop of the Factory of the "Explosives and Chemical Products, Limited," at Bramble Island, Essex, on the 11th July, 1905.

5. Factory and Workshop (Laundries). Copy of List of Religious and Charitable Institutions in which Laundries are carried on (Second Issue).

6. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Reports on the Manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, esquire, preserved at Dropmore, Vol. V., and of the Earl of Verulam, preserved at Gorhambury.

7. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, Vol. I.

8. Mines and Quarries. Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1904; Part II., Labour; General Report

and Statistics relating to persons employed and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, and to the enforcement of the Mines and Quarries Acts.

9. Mines and Quarries. Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1904; Part III., Output; General Report and Statistics relating to the Output and Value of the Minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of Minerals.

10. Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Great Britain). Copy of Forty-eighth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1904. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI.

11. Police (Metropolis). Copy of Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1904.

12. Workmen's Compensation.—Copy of Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900, and The Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1904.

13. Prisons (England and Wales).—Copy of Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1905.

14. Trade Disputes and Trade Combinations (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the subject of Trade Disputes and Trade Combinations, and as to the Law affecting them.

15. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence, Vol. III. Appendices).

16. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inqure into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vols. V. and VI. Maps and Diagrams, with Index.

17. London Traffic (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Means of Locomotion and Transport in London (Vols. VII. and VIII. Report by the Advisory Board of Engineers, with Appendix).

18. Employment of Children Act, 1903.—Copy of Report by Chester Jones, esquire, barrister-at-law, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the Bye-laws made by the London County Council under the Employment of Children Act, 1903.

19. St. Louis International Exhibition, 1904 (Royal Commission). — Copy of Report of His Majesty's Commissioners for the International Exhibition at St. Louis, 1904.

20. Parliamentary Constituencies (Electors, etc.) (United Kingdom).—Copy of Return showing, with regard to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the Total Number, and, as far as possible, the Number in each class, of the Electors on the Register now in force, and also showing the Population and Inhabited Houses in each Constituency.

21. Irish Land Commission (Proceedings).—Copy of Return of Proceedings of the Irish Land Commission during the months of July, August, September, and October, 1905.

22. Irish Land Commission (Estates Commissioners).—Copy of Report of the Estates Commissioners for the period from 1st November, 1903, to 31st March, 1905.

23. National Education (Ireland).—Copy of Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1904. Section II.

24. National Education (Ireland).—Copy of Appendix to the Seventy-first Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1904. Section III.

25. Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Report on the Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 30th June, 1905.

26. Agricultural Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Abstracts showing the Acreage under Crops and the number of Live Stock in each county and province of Ireland for the year 1904–5.

27. Agricultural Statistics (Ireland).—Copy of Agricultural Statistics of Ireland, with detailed Report for the year 1904.

28. Evictions (Ireland).—Copy of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1905.

29. Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices).—Copy of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1905.

30. Lunacy (Ireland).—Copy of Fifty-fourth Report, with Appendices, of Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland) for the year, 1904.

31. Congested Districts Board (Ireland).—Copy of Fourteenth Report of the Congested Districts Board (Ireland), being for the year ending 31st March, 1905.

32. Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Ireland).—Copy of Forty-third Report of the Inspector for the year 1904.

33. Fisheries (Ireland).—Copy of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1904. Part I. General Report.

34. Inebriate Retreats (Ireland).—Copy of First Report, with Appendices, of the Inspector of Inebriate Retreats in Ireland for the years 1903 and 1904.

35. Public Records (Ireland).—Copy of the Thirty-seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland, 1904.

36. Queen's College (Galway).—Copy of Report of the President of Queen's College (Galway) for the Session 1904-5.

37. Queen's College (Belfast).—Copy of Report of the President of Queen's College, Belfast, for the year 1904–5.

38. National School Teachers (Ireland) Pension (Rules).—Copy of Rules (1905), under Section 11 of The National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879.

39. East India (Trade).—Copy of Review of Trade of India for 1904–5.

40. East India (Statistical Abstract).—Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1894–5 to 1903–4. Thirty-ninth Number.

41. East India (Sanitary Measures).—Copy of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1903–4 (Vol. XXXVII.).

42. Imperial Institute (Indian Section).—Copy of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1904–5.

43. East India (Army Administration), Copy of Further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India.

44. East India (Reconstitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam).—Copy of Further Papers relating to the Reconstitution of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam.

45. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Distribution of Grants).—Copy of Annual Report on the Distribution of Grants for Agricultural Education and Research in the year 1904–5, &c.

46. Fruit Culture (Departmental Committee).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to inquire into and report upon the Fruit Industry of Great Britain, with Appendices and Index.

47. Military Prisons.—Copy of Report on the Discipline and Management of Military Prisons in 1904.

48. Army.—Copy of Approximate Estimate of Expenditure (1905–6) under the Military Works Act of 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903.

49. Navy (Gunnery).—Copy of Statement showing Result of Test of Gunlayers with Heavy Guns in His Majesty's Fleet, 1905.

50. Navy.—Copy of a Statement of Admiralty Policy.

51. Board of Education.—Copy of Regulations relating to the Royal College of Science, the Royal College of Art, and to Museums under the Board of Education from 1st August, 1905 to 31st July, 1906.

52. Board of Education.—Copy of Reports from University Colleges, 1905.

53. Board of Education.—Copy of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904–5.

54. Board of Education.—Copy of Reports on Children under Five Years of Age in Public Elementary Schools by Women Inspectors of the Board of Education.

55. Board of Education.—Copy of Report on Charitable Endowments appropriated to purposes of Elementary Education in the Administrative County of Stafford.

56. Board of Education.—Copy of Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales, 1903-5.

57. Board of Education.—Copy of List of Evening Schools under the administration of the Board of Education for the school year 1903-4.

58. Medical Inspection and Feeding of School Children (Inter-Departmental Committee.)—Copy of Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools. Vol. I. Report and Appendices.

59. Medical Inspection and Feeding of School Children (Inter-Departmental Committee.)—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children attending Public Elementary Schools. Vol. II. List of Witnesses, Minutes of Evidence, Appendices and Index.

60. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900 (Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

61. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the County Borough of Devonport (Devonport Light Railway Order, 1905).

62. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The East Sussex Light Railway Order, 1901 (East Sussex Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

63. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Central Essex Light Railway Order, 1901, and The Bardfield and Sible Hedingham Light Railway Order, 1901 (Central Essex Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1905).

64. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Somerset from Priston to Dunkerton (Prison Light Railway Order, 1905).

65. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Padstow, Bedruthan, and Mawgan Light Railway Order, 1903 (Padstow, Bedruthan, and Mawgan Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1905).

66. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the rural districts of Bath and of Keynsham in the county of Somerset, being an extension of the existing and authorised undertaking of Bath Electric Tramways, Limited (Bath Electric Tramways (Light Railway Extensions) Order, 1905).

67. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending The Holmfield and Southowram Light Railway Order, 1902 (Holmfield and Southowram Light Railway (Amendment and Extension of Time) Order, 1905.)

68. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Lincoln and the West Riding of the county of York (Axholme Joint Railway (Hatfield Moor Extension Light Railway) Order, 1905).

69. Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Devon from Newton Ferrers to Yealmpton, and from Kingsbridge to

Slapton and to Salcombe (Devon South Hams Light Railways Order, 1905).

70. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ending 31st March 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

71. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ending 30th June 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

72. Railway Accidents.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 30th September 1905, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

73. Foreign Import Duties.—Copy of Statement of the Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, Egypt, the United States, Japan, China, and Persia, upon the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom in 1905.

74. Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Copy of Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of March 1905 on duty on the railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest.

75. Switzerland.—New Customs Tariff (Interim Statement).—Copy of Translation of the New "General" Customs Tariff of Switzerland, as modified by the New Commercial Treaties concluded with Germany and Italy.

76. Bond Investment Companies (Departmental Committee).—Copy of Report of the Departmental Committee on Bond Investment Companies.

77. Judicial Statistics (Scotland).—Copy of Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland for the year 1904.

78. Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland).—Copy of Supplement to the Forty-eighth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland.

79. Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland).—Copy of Forty-ninth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1903).

80. Secondary Education (Scotland).—Copy of Report for the year 1905 by J. Struthers, Esq., C.B., LL.D., on Secondary Education in Scotland.

81. Peterhead Harbour.—Copy of Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works.

82. Poor Law Commission, 1834.—Copy of the Report made in 1834 by the Poor Law Commissioners.

83. Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copies of Reports, Nos. 454 (Turks and Caicos Islands, Annual Report for 1904), 455 (British Honduras, Annual Report for 1904), 456 (Seychelles, Annual Report for 1904), 457 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1904), 458 (Straits Settlements, Annual Report for 1904), 459 (Southern Nigeria, Annual Report for 1904), 460 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1904), 461 (British Solomon Islands, Reports for 1903–4 and 1904–5), 462 (Malta, Report for 1904–5), 463 (Grenada, Annual Report for 1904), 464 (St. Vincent, Annual Report for 1904), 465 (Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1904), 466 (Barbados, Report for 1904–5), 467 Uganda, Report for 1904–5), 468 (Somaliland, Report for 1904–5), 469 (Trinidad and Tobago, Report for 1904–5), 470 (Lagos, Annual Report for 1904), 471 (Bahamas, Report for 1904–5), 472 (British Central Africa Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 473 (Mauritius, Annual Report for 1904), 474 (Fiji, Annual Report for 1904), 475 (British East Africa Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 476 (Northern Nigeria, Annual Report for 1904), 477 (British Guiana,

Report for 1904–5), 478 (Leeward Islands, Report for 1904–5), 479 (Bechuanaland Protectorate, Report for 1904–5), 480 (Basutoland, Report for 1904–5).

84. Colonial Reports (Miscellaneous).—Copy of Report No. 31 (Northern Nigeria, Report on Cotton, Gum, and other Economic Products (No. II. of Series) by Professor W. Dunstan, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.).

85. Cancer Research (Colonies).—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to the Cancer Research Scheme.

86. Cyprus.—Copy of Annual Report on Cyprus for 1904–5.

87. Cyprus.—Copy of Report by Professor W. Dunstan, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., on the Agricultural Resources of Cyprus, with special reference to Cotton Cultivation, and Correspondence relating thereto.

88. Colonial Conference.—Copy of Correspondence relating to the Future Organisation of Colonial Conferences.

89. Transvaal.—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

90. Transvaal.—Copy of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

91. West Indies.—Copy of the West Indian Inter-Colonial Sanitary Convention, 1904, adopted by Legislation in Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and the Leeward Islands.

92. Straits Settlements.—Copy of Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1904.

93. Nigeria.—Copy of Correspondence relating to Railway Construction in Nigeria.

94. British East Africa Protectorate.—Copy of Report on the Working of the Uganda Railway and the Steamboat Service on Lake Victoria, 1904–5.

95. Canada.—Copy of Despatch from the Governor General of Canada with the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies regarding the importation of Canadian Cattle into the United Kingdom.

96. Western Pacific.—Copy of Report on the Trade of the New Hebrides, by Captain Ernest Rason, R.N., Resident Deputy Commissioner.

97. Treaty Series (No. 20, 1905).—Copy of Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting extra-territorial jurisdiction in Zanzibar. Signed at Washington, 25th February, 1905. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 12th June, 1905.

98. Treaty Series (No. 21, 1905).—Copy of Accession of Mexico to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 13th March, 1905.

99. Treaty Series (No. 22, 1905).—Copy of Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the junction of the Chinese and Burmese Telegraph Lines, being a revision of the Convention of 6th September, 1894. Signed in English and Chinese texts at Pekin, 23rd May, 1905.

100. Treaty Series (No. 23, 1905).—Copy of Declarations between the United Kingdom and Greece, with respect to Commercial matters. Signed at Athens 10th (23rd) November, 1904, and 4th (17th) May, 1905.

101. Treaty Series (No. 24, 1905).—Copy of International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic. Signed at Paris, 18th May, 1904. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 18th January, 1905.

102. Treaty Series (No. 25, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905.

103. Treaty Series (No. 26, 1905).—Copy of Parcel Post Agreement between the United Kingdom and Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, 28th July, 1905.

104. Treaty Series (No. 27, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between the United Kingdom and France relative to the Arbitral Tribunal contemplated by Article III. of the Convention of 8th April, 1904, respecting Newfoundland. Signed at London, 7th April, 1905.

105. Africa (No. 6, 1905).—Copy of Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate.

106. Japan (No. 2, 1905).—Copy of Despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg forwarding a Copy of

the Agreement between the United Kingdom and Japan. Signed at London, 12th August, 1905.

107. Turkey (No. 3, 1905).—Copy of Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of South Eastern Europe.

108. China (No. 2, 1905).—Copy of Report by Mr. Walter J. Clennell, His Majesty's Consul at Kiukiang, on a Journey in the Interior of Kiangsi, with a Map.

109. France (No. 1, 1905).—Copy of Agreement between His Majesty's Government and the French Government for the constitution of an Arbitral Tribunal to settle the Indemnity to be awarded to the French citizens lately engaged in the Fishery on the Treaty Shore of Newfoundland, and Statement of Sums allotted by the Arbitrators.

110. Muscat (No. 1, 1905).—Copy of the Award of the Arbitration Tribunal appointed to decide on the question of the Grant of the French Flag to Muscat Dhows.

111. Navigable Inland Waterways (Commercial, No. 4, 1905).—Copies of Further Reports from His Majesty's Representatives on Navigable Inland Waterways in Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands.

112. Commercial Treaty with Roumania (Commercial, No. 5, 1905).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Bucharest transmitting the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Roumania, signed on the 31st October, 1905.

113. Commercial Convention with Bulgaria (Commercial, No. 1, 1906).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Sofia, transmitting the Commercial Convention between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria, signed on the 9th December, 1905.

114. Commercial Treaty with Cuba (Commercial, No. 2, 1906).—Copy of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Havana, transmitting the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United Kingdom and Cuba, signed at Havana on the 4th May, 1905.

115. Argentina and Chile (Miscellaneous, No. 4, 1905).—Copies of Agreements between the Argentine Republic and the Republic of Chile, signed on the 28th May, 1902, 10th July, 1902, and 9th January, 1903 [Address 8th August, 1905.—*Mr. Cremer*].

116. Trade Reports (Annual Series). —Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3475 to 3521.

117. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 636 to 642.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1905-1906).

Estimate presented, of the Further Sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 1.]

METEOROLOGY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Meteorological Council to the Royal Society for the year ending 31st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DUCHY OF CORNWALL.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Disbursements of the Duchy of Cornwall for the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 2.]

IMPERIAL OTTOMAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1855.

Copy presented, of Account for the year 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Copy presented, of Return of the amount of Notes issued more than 40 years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off on the 8th November, 1905, from the total amount of Notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CHELSEA HOSPITAL (ARMY PRIZE MONEY AND LEGACY FUNDS).

Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital (for Services other than those voted by Parliament) in the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS, INCLUDING TELEPHONES.

Account presented, showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the Telegraph Service during the year ended 31st March, 1905, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 3.]

PUBLIC OFFICES SITE (DUBLIN) ACT, 1903.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Public Offices Site (Dublin) Act, 1903, and of the Expenditure; the Money expended and borrowed and the Securities created under the said Act for the period ended the 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE ACT, 1897; PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1898; AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1903.

Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to the 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 4.]

LAND REGISTRY (NEW BUILDINGS) ACT, 1900.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund, under the provisions of The Land Registry (New Buildings) Act, 1900, and of the Expenditure; the Money expended and borrowed and the securities created under the said Act, for the period ended the 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 5.]

NAVAL WORKS ACTS, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1899, 1901, AND 1903.

Account presented, showing the amount of Money issued out of the Consolidated Fund; the mode in which it was provided; the amount and nature of the Securities created in respect thereof; the amount of the surplus of Income above Expenditure for the financial year ended 31st March, 1896, and the amount of Money expended in pursuance of the Acts during the year ended the 31st March, 1905; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 6.]

NAVY (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).

Copy presented, of the Appropriation Account of the Navy for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, and upon the Store Accounts of the Navy [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 7.]

ARMY (APPROPRIATION) ACCOUNT.

Copy presented, of the Appropriation Account for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, and upon the Store Accounts of the Army [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 8.]

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).

Appropriation Account presented, of the sums granted by Parliament for the expense of the Ordnance Factories, the cost of the productions of which have been charged to the Army, Navy, and Indian and Colonial Governments, etc., and the Statement of the Surpluses and Deficits upon the Grants for the year ended 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 9.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (APPROPRIATIONS ACCOUNTS).

Appropriation Accounts presented, for the year ending 31st March, 1905, together with the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon and certain Reports upon Store Accounts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 10.]

TREASURY CHEST.

Account presented, for the year 1904–5, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 11.]

MILITARY WORKS ACTS, 1897, 1899, 1901, AND 1903.

Account presented, for the period ended 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 12.]

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th February, 1906, authorising the lease of a plot of land at the Dalkey end of the disused Tramway from Kingstown to Dalkey [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SAVINGS BANKS (INVESTMENT) REGULATIONS.

Copy presented, of Draft Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes declaring that the undermentioned persons were appointed to the offices set against their names without a Civil Service Certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their Departments, viz.:—William Chevalier, Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Giovanni Fabri, Assistant Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Saverio Inglott, Shipping Clerk, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Shukrallah Fathallah Huri, Dragoman, H.M.S. Consulate, Alexandria; Harry Mott, Postmaster, Cowes; William Fretton, Bridewell Keeper, at New Ross Bridewell, Irish Prisons Service; William Henry Edey, Admiralty Writer; Thomas Moodie, Engineer in Charge of Pumping Machinery, Dover, War Office; [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes granting a retired allowance to each of the following, viz.:—Charles Bennet, 1st Class Assistant Architect and Surveyor, Office of Works; Reginald P. Tibbs, Deputy Cashier in Charge, Royal Victoria Yard, Deptford; J. W. Metcalfe, Sorting Clerk and Telegraphist; W. F. Ridsdale, Sorting Clerk and Telegraphist; R. L. Frost, 1st Class Clerk, Money Orders Office; W. B. Crane, Overseer and Senior Telegraphist, Central Telegraph Office; [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 12th January, 1906, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Treasury Solicitor in Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the months of November and December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903 (REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant in pursuance of the provisions of Section 23 (8) of The Irish Land Act, 1903 [by Command] to lie upon the Table.

COMMITTALS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Returns from the Clerks of the Crown and Peace of the number of persons committed for trial in 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDERS).

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Urban District Councils of Ballymoney, Coleraine, Limavady, Portadown, Ballymena, and Banbridge, and confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, closing certain Shops within the said Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor, Monaghan, and Carrickmacross [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of the Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed) Ireland, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MILITIA ACT, 1882 (DEPUTY LIEUTENANTS, IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of descriptions of qualifications of Deputy Lieutenants lodged during 1905, as furnished to the Chief Secretary for Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).

Copies presented, of Four Orders in Council, dated 4th November, 1905, for holding Winter Assizes in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PHARMACY ACTS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 4th November, 1905, approving Regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PHARMACY ACTS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 7th February, 1906, approving of an amended Regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the appointment of Members of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order closing the Female Prison at Limerick under the General Prisons (Ireland) Act, 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Time Table of Examinations for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland identifying the Syllabuses of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the purposes of the Rules of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland prescribing an alternative work in the Middle Grade Pass Programme in French for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland substituting a work in the Middle Grade Honours Programme in Irish, 1906, for that originally prescribed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE (EDUCATION) IRELAND.

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland amending Rule 42 (IV.) I. (6) and

Rule 45 of the Rules of 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Rules and Regulations under The Railways (Ireland) Act, 1896, for Pickle Point Pier [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (PROCLAMATION).

Copy presented, of a Proclamation, dated 6th February, 1906, revoking the several Proclamations mentioned in the Schedule thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Councils of the Boroughs of Accrington, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bury, Battersea, Deptford, Greenwich, Halifax, Middlesborough, Swindon, Wolverhampton, Cardiff, Pontypridd, Stockport, St. Helens, Shipley, Southwark, Swansea, Camberwell, Barnsley, Newport (Mon.), Darwen, Grimsby, Stafford, Birkenhead, Leicester, and Barrow-in-Furness, and of the Counties of Lancaster and Monmouth, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Rochdale, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Barbers' and Butchers' Shops within the Borough, by the Council of the Borough of Oldham, fixing the hours of closing for shops in which the trade or business of a Barber, Hairdresser, Boot and Shoe Dealer, or Tailor is carried on, and by the Council of the Borough of Salford fixing the hours of closing for all shops at which the trade or business of a Boot Retailer is carried on [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (BOROUGH OF BIRKENHEAD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Birkenhead, altering one of the Polling Districts in the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF ESSEX).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Essex, altering certain Polling Districts in the Romford Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Southampton constituting the Parish of Grayshott a separate Polling District in the Petersfield Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Southampton altering certain Polling Districts in the New Forest Parliamentary Division of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Lancaster redividing the Ormskirk, Prestwich, and Stretford Parliamentary Divisions into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Stafford constituting the Parish of Quarry Bank a separate Polling District of the Kingswinford Division of the County for the purposes of Parliamentary Elections [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HUNTINGDON).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Huntingdon altering certain Polling Districts in the northern Parliamentary Division of the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGH OF CHELSEA).

Copy presented, of Order made by the justices of the Kensington Petty Sessional Division, dividing the Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea into Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Durham altering certain Polling Districts in the Bishop Auckland and Mid Parliamentary Divisions of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Southampton constituting the Blackmoor Ward of the Parish of Selborne a separate Polling District in the Petersfield Parliamentary Division of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DORSET).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Dorset dividing the Parish of Corfe Mullen into Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SURREY).

Copies presented, of three Orders made by the County Council of the County of Surrey altering certain Polling Districts within the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Margaret Hartley, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the East End Refuge, Finchley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of a Licence to be at large granted to Sarah Craddock, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the London Female Preventive and Reformatory Institution, Holloway, N. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of a Licence to be at large granted to Ada Brown, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Home of Compassion, Pimlico, S.W. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCES).

Copies presented, of Licences to be at large granted to Marion Seddon, William Grant, George Lamb, and John Bowd, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A. of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 12th December, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the process of sorting, willeying, washing, combing, and carding wool, goats' hair and camel hair, and processes incidental thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 17th October, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, in respect of the process of spinning by self-acting mules [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (HOME-WORK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 15th August, 1905, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACT, 1904 (REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 1 of The Secretary for Scotland Act, 1904, as to the transfer to the Secretary for Scotland of certain powers and duties in connection with Reformatories and Industrial Schools [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS.

Copy presented, of Rules and Regulations for the Administration of the Central Prison, Grand Turk [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ST. VINCENT.

Copy presented, of Rules for the Government of the Prison in St. Vincent [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of Comparative Statement of Pauperism and Cost of the Relief of the Poor in certain years from 1848–9 to 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (EXAMINATIONS).

Copy presented, of Revision of paragraph 8 of the Regulations for the admission of Candidates to the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA).
EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1905, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 13.]

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 14.]

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (EDUCATION).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th August, 1904; *Sir William Anson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 15.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council continuing certain provisions in the Order in Council of 6th March, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Merton College, Oxford, on 18th March, 1904, amending the Statutes III. and IV. of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 16.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 11th March, 1905, amending the Ordinance regulating the Radcliffe Travelling Fellowships [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 17.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 23rd November, 1904, amending Statute IV. and Schedule B of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 18.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford, on 29th June, 1905, altering Statutes XI., XVI., and XVIII. of the Statutes of the House [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 19.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of New College, Oxford, on 21st June, 1905, in lieu of Statutes IV. and XIV. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 20.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, amending Article 10 of the Regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 11th August, 1834, for preventing Collisions at Sea [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, approving certain new Pilotage Bye-laws made by the Pilotage Board of Port Talbot [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, revoking a proviso in paragraph 24 of the Regulations scheduled to the Order in Council of 24th March, 1902, relating to the Registry of British Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 11th December, 1905, entitled The Brunei Order in Council, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented of Order in Council of the 8th January, 1906, entitled the Somaliland Order in Council, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented of Order in Council of 8th January, 1906, making provision for a Seal for His Britannic Majesty's Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1858.

Copy presented of Order in Council of 11th December, 1905, approving a statement of new and revised appointments and alterations of salaries in the establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876, AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACT, 1866.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 20th November, 1905 amending the Order in Council of 20th March, 1877, relating to Day Industrial Schools and revoking the previous amending Order of 11th July, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL PROBATES ACT, 1892.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd October, 1905, applying The Colonial Probates Act, 1892, to the Orange River Colony [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 20th November, 1905, approving a Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for transferring to the Newcastle Chapter Endowment Fund the Endowment of a Canonry in the Cathedral Church of Durham [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 20th November, 1905, approving a Memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to a rule by which Retired Pay and Pensions, except Pensions for Wounds, of Commissioned, Commissioned Warrant, and Warrant Officers, shall be held only during good behaviour, and may be forfeited or suspended for misconduct, or restored at the discretion of the Admiralty [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report for the year 1905 by the Director on the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 21.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Secretary for Scotland providing for the Early Closing of certain Shops in the Burghs of Paisley, Motherwell, Dundee, Clydebank, Govan, Glasgow, Kinning Park, and Partick [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

Copy presented, of Report on the state of the Finances of the University made by the University Court, for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 22.]

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 23.]

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Glasgow for 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 24.]

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance No. XI. (Edinburgh, No. 4) (Institution of Degrees in Veterinary Medicine and Surgery and relative Regulations [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 25.]

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance No. XII. (Edinburgh, No. 5) (Inclusion of Geography among the subjects qualifying for Graduation in Arts) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 26.]

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of Ordinance of the University Courts of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh (General, No. 1) (Regulations for Degrees in Arts, Supplementary to Ordinance No. 11 (General, No. 6) of the Universities Commissioners) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 27.]

LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS ACT, 1896, AND MOTOR CAR ACT, 1903.

Copies presented, of Orders by the Secretary for Scotland prohibiting Motor Car Traffic on certain highways in the counties of Haddington, Forfar, Argyll (Districts of Ardnamurchan and the Island of Mull), and Bute (District of the Island of Arran) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of Regulation, dated 14th November, 1905, made by the Local Government Board for Scotland under The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Section 4 (3), respecting Organisation for Unemployed [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of Act of Adjournal for regulating the Procedure in Scotland under The Aliens Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of a Licence granted to Robert Allan, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1867 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 18) Warrant, 1905, dated 21st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 16) Warrant, 1905, dated 12th August, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (INLAND POST).

Copy presented, of the Inland Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1905, dated 28th December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHS).

Copy presented, of the Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1905, dated 1st September, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1906–1907.

Estimates presented, for the year 1906–7, with Explanation of Differences [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 28].

NAVY (STATEMENT EXPLANATORY OF ESTIMATES).

Copy presented, of Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Navy Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (BATTLE PRACTICE).

Copy presented, of Result of Battle Practice in His Majesty's Fleet, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION).

Accounts presented, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 29.]

TREATY SERIES (NO. 1, 1906).

Copy presented, of Agreement additional to the Money Order Convention of 8th December, 1882, between the United Kingdom and France. Signed at Paris, 20th April, 1904. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR CONVENTION (COMMERCIAL, NO. 3, 1906).

Copy presented, of Report of British Delegate at the International Sugar Commission, Autumn Session, 1905, and Correspondence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED SEAMEN.

Account presented, of the Sums received and paid in respect of the Wages and Effects of Deceased Seamen in the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE UNIONS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions in 1902–4, with Comparative Statistics for 1895–1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PASSENGERS TO PLACES OUT OF EUROPE.

Copy presented, of Return of the Numbers and Nationalities of the Passengers that left the United Kingdom for Places out of Europe in each month of the year 1906, distinguishing the principal Countries in which the Passengers contracted to land [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES.

Copy presented, of Statements of Accounts, and of Life Assurance and Annuity Business and Abstracts of Actuarial Reports, deposited with the Board of Trade during the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 30.]

RAMSGATE HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st March, 1905, together with an Account of the Receipt and Issue of Stores [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 31.]

GENERAL LIGHTHOUSE FUND.

Account presented, of the General Lighthouse Fund showing the income and expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 32.]

WEST HIGHLAND RAILWAY (EXTENSION FROM BANAVIE TO MALLAIG).

Copy presented, of Fourth Annual Report by the Board of Trade as to the condition and working of the Benavie and Mallaig Railway, the rates and charges for traffic, and the receipts and expenditure of any Company in working the Railway, for the year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 33.]

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903).

Copies presented, of Orders entitled; (1) The Hull (Channel Islands Animals) Landing Place Revocation Order of 1905, and (2) The Manchester (Old Trafford) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Union of Benefices Act (Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink).—Copy of Scheme under the Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink [by Act].

2. Union of Benefices Act (St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse).—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an union of the Benefices of St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse [by Act].

3. Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 34.]

4. Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.—Copy of Accounts of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board for the year ending 1st July, 1905 [by Act].

5. Lunacy.—Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of Patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics between 1st April, 1905, and 30th September, 1905 [by Act].

6. Lunacy.—Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of Patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on the 31st December, 1905 [by Act].

7. Lunacy.—Copy of Return of all sums received by the Visitors of Lunatics for travelling expenses, or upon any other account, from 1st January to 31st December, 1905 [by Act].

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to give notice that on an early day I shall move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Acts.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): On an early day, a Bill to amend the Labourers' (Ireland) Acts.

MR. BIRRELL (Bristol, N.): On an early day a Bill to amend the law relating to education in England and Wales.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) (in behalf of the President of the Board of Trade): On an early day, a Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: On an early day, a Bill to explain the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts.

KING'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER reported His Majesty's Speech, and read it to the House.

KING'S SPEECH. (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.)

*MR. W. H. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.): I believe no Englishman can enter this chamber for the first time, without a feeling of awe, and no man can rise to speak for the first time, as I do on this Motion, without an overwhelming sense of his own incompetence to acquit himself worthily of this Assembly. The honour laid upon me is due to no personal merit of my own, but to the fact that I am an humble member of that band of Liberals whose efforts have succeeded in converting London from what we look upon as the darkness of error to the light of the Gospel of Truth. I venture to say the great change of political opinion in London is one of the most remarkable and important features of this most remarkable and important election. No one recognised more keenly the importance of metropolitan opinion than the late Prime Minister. Speaking at the Queen's Hall on the 29th of December, with reference to the fidelity of London to the Unionist cause, Mr. Balfour said—

> "I refuse to believe—I cannot believe the London which has been so faithful to this great cause, will turn round and, false to its own past, forgetful of its own traditions, give an example to the rest of the country which might prove the

death knell of all that most of us here regard as best worth living for in public life."

The London elections have indeed proved a death knell, not only to the Leader, but to many of his followers. But if these elections sounded as a knell to some, to others they were "Bells as musical as those which on the golden shafted trees of Eden shook by the eternal breeze." They have rung out to many a desolate home a message of hope where hitherto there has been despair. I recognise that there has been considerable criticism directed to the fact that this Motion has been entrusted to a town Member rather than to a country Member. Although I am, of course, personally innocent of this great offence, I fully recognise the heinousness of the crime which has ventured to place the representation of flesh and blood on a level with the representation of broad acres. But it is only one of the many signs that public opinion is gradually realising that the destinies of a great nation more and more depend upon the condition of its town people. Count Tolstoy has recently said that towns are places where mankind is beginning to rot, and within a rifle shot of this House there are many districts to which that description accurately applies. It is these districts chiefly that we London Liberal Members represent. We bring no message from the depopulated warehouses of the City or the mansions of Mayfair. We have been entrusted, and honoured with the confidence of the poor, and I believe I am expressing the wishes of all my colleagues when I say we feel deeply the responsibility which has been laid upon us of doing what we can to improve the conditions of the poor. And so it is with the greatest gratification that we find that the first message His Majesty has addressed to the new Parliament is so replete with promises of reform which will materially improve the conditions of the common people. Their Majesties the King and Queen—and in referring to them I may be allowed to express our deep sympathy with Her Majesty the Queen in her sad bereavement—Their Majesties have ever shown the greatest practical and personal interest in all measures which relate to the amelioration of the condition of their humblest subjects, and it must be a source of pleasure to them to feel that they have behind them now a Government and a Parliament whose great object it will be to lift up the poorer people of this country. I believe that when we have completed the labours that are submitted to us in the King's Speech—when we have done what we can to improve the education of the children, to bring back, if possible, the labourer to the land, to redress the injustices from which the great industrial corporations are suffering, to equalise the charges of the rates upon the poorer inhabitants of the Metropolis, to do something to amend the Act which grants relief to the deserving poor when out of employment, we shall have found that our work will have been amply repaid by the results. There are other reforms which I would like to see included in the King's Speech, but we can well afford to wait. It is better that there should be a few promises capable of fulfilment than that there should be a long string of proposals which cannot be carried out. But if there are reforms which I would have wished to see inserted there is one reform, which all must be delighted to see has been omitted from the King's Speech, a reform that is no reform; but rather reaction masquerading in the guise of a reform. I refer of course to fiscal reform. The intelligent foreigner who has watched the proceedings in this country for the last two or three years must wonder why no reference is made to this great subject in the King's Speech. Ever since the year 1903, when we witnessed the unexpected and brilliant spectacle of an eruption in Birmingham, this country has been flooded with fiery denunciations against our whole commercial system, and enveloped in a cloud of facts and figures through which the ordinary elector has had the greatest difficulty in groping his way. Since that time we have talked of nothing else but the fiscal controversy. It has been discussed and re-discussed on the platform, in the Press, in public, and in private. It has been the sole issue of many a bye-election; it has been the main issue of the general election. We, Parliamentary candidates, have had to furbish up our principles of political economy and investigate the details of our domestic economy. We have expatiated upon exports. We have perorated on prices. We have replied to the horrors of the competition of the German workman with the horrors of the composition of German sausages. But after all this warfare we find nothing is said with regard to the subject in the King's Speech, and I may in all seriousness say that we thank God for it. It is a tacit announcement that this great controversy is come to an end for the moment. I say for the moment, because the volcano is not extinct. It is only quiescent. But there is one thing which has been settled by the election and that is that if you want to consolidate the Empire you must not put a tax upon food. The great cities of this country have declared in favour of free trade. [Cries of "No."] All the cities with one notable and misguided exception have declared in favour of free trade, and for the reason that they know better than anyone how a tax upon food would affect their congested and poor population. London has done many things to earn the gratitude of the nation, but I believe she has never merited it more than when, in spite of her political proclivities, like the deaf adder, she stopped her ears, refusing to hear the voice of the charmer, charmed he never so wisely, and flung the whole weight of her wealth, her intelligence, and her influence on to the side of the poor. But this controversy is now at an end, and there is a chance of commercial peace. After a war from which we are suffering almost as much as the Boers themselves, what we desire for the future is a period of rest in order to recoup our commercial position. Had the country at the election decided that we were to embark on a policy of retaliation that must necessarily have been followed by disputes between ourselves and other countries, and possibly international complications. But, fortunately, now we can proceed with our commerce in peace, and we have the assurance, which we welcome from His Majesty, that we are now at last at peace with the world. May it be long ere we again fail to reap its advantages. It is a trite observation that in order to ensure peace you must prepare for war, but there are various methods of preparation for war, and one of the most effective methods is that we should be at peace amongst ourselves. We must, therefore, welcome the announcement in the King's Speech that the Government have been giving and are giving their attention to the task of eliminating the two causes of discontent which still are a menace to the peace of our Empire. The paragraph in His Majesty's Speech relating to Ireland will commend itself to all reasonable men except those whose function it is to misrepresent the intentions of their opponents. That something must be done to improve the internal administration of Ireland is admitted by all. That this can only be effected by some kind of compromise is also clear. If we recognise that the two countries are permanently united both by nature, by self-interest, and by law, it ought not to be impossible to eradicate this long standing difference between two high-minded and generous nations. The same with regard to the Transvaal. The Transvaal stands in a different position because no one has denied that the Government of the Transvaal and that of the Orange River Colony should be dealt with in precisely the same manner as the other self-governing colonies, and the only question was at what period this should take place. This action is to take place forthwith, and His Majesty has decided to recall the Letters Patent, issued by the late administration, which provided for the intermediate stage of representative government. The proposals of the late Government were faulty in two respects. Firstly they proposed to set up an elective body to which should be given no real executive power. If that were done I feel convinced that the result would be that the body itself would be very much weakened in its calibre from the commencement. Secondly, there would have been a constant friction between the popularly-elected body and the executive government which could not have conduced to the peace of the Empire. It is therefore only right—and I believe that European opinion in South Africa itself is almost entirely convinced with regard to this—to give responsible government at the earliest moment. But concurrently with this it is clear that if a permanent administration is set up in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony that administration must be based upon an electoral system which would give satisfaction to all classes alike. It would be most unfortunate to have started a new government in the Transvaal and then to find that a large class of the electorate felt themselves either excluded from the franchise or unjustly treated. Therefore the announcement that it is intended to inquire by some thoroughly impartial means into the effect which the various proposals for the reform of the electoral law will have when it comes into operation will be not only welcomed in South Africa but throughout all our Colonies as an earnest that the Government's sole desire is to do equal justice to all the King's subjects, and it will tend more than anything else to realise the hope, so eloquently expressed by His Majesty this morning, that—

> "In these Colonies, as elsewhere throughout His dominions, the grant of free institutions will be followed by an increase of prosperity and loyalty to the Empire."

I beg to move.

*MR. ACLAND (Yorkshire, Richmond): I beg to second the Address which has just been moved. In doing so I feel that I can rely upon the kindly forbearance and consideration which is usually extended to those who occupy this difficult position. This forbearance was not necessary in the case of the mover, because he is a gentleman of tried experience and ability; but I hope that the House will be willing to exercise it in my case, recognising that I have none of my hon. friend's personal fitness for this honour. The House, I think, will be all the more willing to extend to me its indulgence because this is the first session of a new Parliament containing so many new Members who are much better fitted than I am to discharge this duty. The Speech from the Throne contains many references to foreign affairs about which I only need to say—and in this, at any rate, I know I shall have the agreement of everyone present—that this House is deeply conscious that the happy position which this country now occupies among the nations of the earth is largely due to His Majesty's zealous care for the welfare of his Empire, and to his great personal desire to cultivate friendly relations with foreign Powers. When we see so many references to foreign affairs in the different parts of the world we cannot fail to recognise the variety, complexity, and difficulty of the task which must fall upon the Minister entrusted with them. If anything could do so, this will add to our heartfelt grief, and to the sympathy which we extend to him in his bereavement. With regard to South Africa, I am sure the House will appreciate the difficult problem which faced the Ministry on their entry to office, and will recognise, I hope, the reasonableness of asking for sufficient time to collect the information which will enable this House to come to a wise and right decision. We trust that the time which will elapse before a permanent form of self-government is established will be brief, but yet sufficient for the preparation and due discussion in this House of a constitution which will be acknowledged as fair and just by all races and interests in our great new Colonies in South Africa. We trust that in these Colonies, as hitherto in our long colonial history, freedom may become the mother of prosperity and loyalty. I am sure that we shall look forward to seeing the representatives from those colonies taking their share together with the citizens of this great Empire from other parts of the world in the Conference which we are glad to know is to meet next year. We trust that those deliberations may be fruitful in strengthening those bonds of sentiment, of affection, and the common enjoyment of common freedom which are the true foundations of empire. The remarkable growth of our trade both at home and abroad has been referred to. However great the prosperity it has caused in many districts we cannot forget that there are still many persons in many parts of the country struggling against the degradation of poverty. I have confidence that the Government will do their utmost so to relieve and readjust the burdens of taxation that this poverty may be reduced. The difficulties, however, will be very great. None will realise more than hon. Members of this House who, like myself, have been fortunate enough to enjoy some experience in the Civil Service, how easy it is to spend a nation's money, and how difficult it is to economise when a liability has once been created. It will have been noticed that the last paragraphs of the Speech fall into two parts, first a statement of the matters which are under consideration with a view to future administrative or legislative action, and, secondly, an enumeration of the Bills which are to be laid before Parliament during the present session. In the first part fall the references to Ireland and to rural depopulation. I think that there can be no ground for controversy on either of these matters. With regard to Ireland, the objects which it is desired to further are only such as have been the policy of the predecessors of the present Ministers. There has been no lack of sympathy with these objects on the other side of the House, and even of desire to carry them into effect, but much to the disappointment of many hon. Members on both sides, this desire has hitherto failed of fruition. The present Government has not only the will but the courage to act, and I am sure that when action is proposed, it will be widely welcomed. With regard to the condition of the rural districts, hon. Members will be aware that an important inter-departmental Committee is now sitting, and they will agree that no legislation can be drafted until we are in possession of its report. The question of encouraging settlement on the land by those who are at present deprived of access to it is of the very first importance, but that is only a part of the vast land question in general. There will be many other Liberal Members now for the first time returned by agricultural divisions who realise how strong is the hope in such districts that comprehensive measures will be laid before us, which will secure not only this object, but a more economical and profitable use of the land by the present farming class. We are glad, therefore, to know that this indispensable preliminary consideration is being undertaken. In the legislation proposed for this session, pride of place is given to education. This is, if I may venture to say so, not only right, but inevitable. For almost exactly four years education has been a platform battle cry, and it has grievously suffered in consequence. While one party has been exulting in victory, the other has been smarting under defeat, and all the while boys and girls have been going out into the battle of life less well-prepared to face the world than they would have been if a fraction of the energy which has gone into this strife had been given to furthering education itself. All parties, I believe, recognise that this must cease. All parties, I hope, are willing to allow the religious difficulty to be composed. When once this is settled, and elementary education for the first time is placed upon a truly popular and national basis, the way will be open for many improvements in it which are now impossible of attainment, and with these improvements there will, we hope, come others in our system of higher education, upon which depends in such a great degree our standing among the nations. There is no doubt that large sections of the community are now willing to approach this question in the broadest spirit of citizenship, intent only upon freedom and peace. May I venture to express the hope that this spirit may animate our debates, and that we may set before ourselves with single-mindedness the welfare of the child, which I believe to be the path of true progress. I need only further occupy your time with a brief mention of two other measures. The Trades Disputes Bill will, I hope, be found to redress the disabilities which have within the last few years unexpectedly hampered the action of Trades Unions for the good of their members. The proposal for amending the Workmen's Compensation Acts are as urgently necessary as any other measure to be laid before the House. Every week working men and their families are left in want and destitution because of the limitations of the present law. It is to be hoped that the proposals to be made will not only simplify but widely extend its operations. I should only weary the House even more than I have done already were I even to mention the other matters which will demand our attention. Each of them is of some urgency and importance. May I, in conclusion, mention one of the many reasons which make me so proud to occupy this position. The people of this country at the General Election, not only refused their assent to a great departure from established fiscal traditions, but they also recalled to power and armed with authority a Government with a known and declared policy of social reform. The measures to be put before us during this session constitute a bold and firm step forward towards its fulfilment. It is therefore with pride in being allowed to take even the humblest part in assisting towards the fulfilment of this policy, and with heartfelt hope for its success that I second the Motion now before the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the

United Kingdom and Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I think I might very properly imitate the example of the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken if I also were to plead for the consideration of the House in the very difficult position in which I find myself. At the request of my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, who is temporarily absent, I am endeavouring, however inadequately, to act as his substitute to-night. I suppose it would be too much to ask of human nature to expect that the Prime Minister would or could express any regret at the series of triumphs which culminated in that great victory at Manchester, which for the moment has deprived him of his principal antagonist. But, although as a politician he must necessarily rejoice, I am sure that, looking at the matter as a personal question only, he will join us most heartily in welcoming back to the House its late Leader—the man who for a longer period than any one in the past century has led its deliberations with constant ability, courage and courtesy. I have often thought that the task performed by the hon. Members for St. Pancras and the Richmond division of Yorkshire is one of the most difficult to fall to the lot of any Parliamentarian; for what is it? They are expected by a convention, which has become almost an absolute rule, to expound and develop the topics of the King's Speech, avoiding anything in the nature of platitude, and equally avoiding anything in the nature of hard controversy. The hon. Member who spoke last, and who, if I had to use the language of his colleague, I must describe as the representative, not of men, but of broad acres, discharged that difficult task in the most admirable and satisfactory manner, and the way in which he dealt with his task gave as much pleasure to his opponents as he could have done—I am speaking of his style and manner—to his friends. I have had the honour of knowing his father and grandfather in this House. He comes of a family which is so closely connected with our Parliamentary history that it is almost a part of its traditions, and we all delight in thinking that he will for the future be a worthy representative, and that we may often have the pleasure of hearing him in debate. I wish I could speak in the same way of the other speech which we were compelled to listen to, and which certainly formed a precedent in more ways than one. It is a precedent which I hope will be avoided in the future. Both hon. Gentlemen, I think, may be congratulated on having been called upon to take part in what they have described very properly as an unparalleled and exceptionally interesting Parliament. Mostly interesting is it in its composition, in the struggle which preceded it, and in the circumstances under which it now exists, and we shall, I think, be excused if before we proceed to the topics of the King's Speech we say a word or two about the Parliament which opens its first session to-day. The record of this election is absolutely, I think, unparalleled. It has ended in an unparalleled victory for the other side. I have seen it stated in some quarters, which I think are not altogether friendly to the Government, that those legions we see opposite to us are fissiparous and composite, but I shall not attempt prematurely to analyse their composition. On the contrary, I think it would be improper to minimise their victory or question their power. I have been curious, and I dare say many have been curious, to know whether one can find in Parliamentary history any complete analogy. To find anything like it one has to go back to the defeat of the Coalition Ministry of Fox and North in 1784 when Pitt took office. I find on that occasion the Coalition Government lost 160 seats. I am afraid that on these Benches we have to mourn a loss of something over 200. Again in 1833, after the Reform Bill, the Liberals came back. This is rather nearer the existing condition of things. The Liberals came back 486 strong and the Conservatives 172. The majority, therefore, of the Liberals in this House was 314. Now I reckon it is something like 315. There is in all this one grain of comfort. When we look back, what do we find? We find that these great and overpowering majorities have been in existence before and that no special disaster has befallen the country in consequence. And we have also seen that the defeated Party on those occasions has not been permanently excluded from office. On reading one of the letters of Sidney Smith, after the great defeat of the Whigs, I think it was Lord Grey's Government, I find that he said that he and his Whig friends had been terribly cut up by what had happened, and that they had been going about very dejected until it suddenly occurred to him to go out to his garden and sow some mustard and cress. In two or three days, almost to his surprise, he found that the mustard and cress was coming up and that the general operations of nature were proceeding without any interruption. Thereupon he and his friends began to recover from the difficulties in which they found themselves. Now one other observation I would make and it is this—I do not know what the exact figures are, but I find that some of the newspapers have been trying to discover what is the majority of votes which is accountable for this immense majority in the House, and I understand they calculate that something like a majority of 5 per cent. of the votes accounts for the majority in this House of 50 per cent. I do not know, as I say, whether that is correct, but it is immaterial to what I am going to say. In any case, it will be admitted that the majority in the House is in very much greater proportion than the majority in the country. It is always worth while to remember, when you are not really satisfied with beating us but condemn us also, that we have a large body of the people of the country behind us in these unfortunate times. If my friend Mr. Leonard Courtney had been fortunate enough to be returned, what a text he would have had for his sermon on minority representation. I wish to say, however, that I take what I think is a more manly view of the position, and I rejoice that as you have come in you should be strong and that your numerical majority for executive and administrative purposes in the House should be larger than your actual majority in the country. A weak Government is, in my opinion, the worst form of Government you could possibly have. It is desirable that each Party in turn—and remember our turn will come—should have a large and powerful majority. Of course, with such a powerful majority, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister recognises that he has proportional responsibility. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the other day, the Liberal Party for the first time for many years is master in its own House, and no longer can it be truly said of the Liberal Party that though the Liberal Party was in power there were Gentlemen on these benches who held it in the hollow of their hand. They are now entirely independent, and being independent I hope they will show their independence, and that we shall have no occasion to doubt that what they do is done from the fulness of their heart and with their own thorough approval, and not because there are others exercising an improper influence over them. We can object to what the Government does, we can criticise, but there is no possible combination we can form by which we can turn them out of office, and that is a very comfortable position for them. It is one which after all makes our position a little easier than it might otherwise have been. The Prime Minister, speaking the other day, attributed to me a statement that our business was to harass the Government on all possible occasions. I really do not know where he got that from. I am not aware of, in any speech, having made a statement of that general kind. The Prime Minister said that he did not object to our criticising them when they were wrong, and I assume that we may avail ourselves of that gracious permission. When he is right and when there is no great principle at stake I assure him that he need have no reason whatever to dread the factious opposition of which other Governments have complained. In the opening words of His Majesty's gracious Speech none of us, I am sure, will find any grounds for factious or other criticism. The personal touch with which His Majesty communicates to the House of Commons the bereavement which he and especially the Queen have sustained by the death of the King of Denmark will, I believe, evoke sympathy among all his subjects. The late King of Denmark was the Nestor of European monarchs, and earned the best and most enviable reward in the tribute of affection and regard which has been paid to him by his own subjects. I note in passing what I am sure will have given pleasure to the House—the allusion to the journey of the Prince of Wales. We all know that the personal link with the Crown is of the utmost importance to the Government of the great dependency of India, and we rejoice to think that the visit has been and continues to be an altogether entire success. Then the Speech goes on to deal with foreign affairs, and in its statements it only gives us confirmation of what we have learned from speeches made by Ministers, namely, that in our foreign policy there will be continuity. We have nothing to do but to express satisfaction in that matter. We all recognise that the representations the British Government has to make in the interests of our fellow subjects are enormously strengthened when foreign nations know that what is said by one Government will be said by another, and that all proceed on the same principles and policy. I would like to ask two questions in regard to this, though I should not think of pressing them if there is no information the Government at present are able to give. We hear a great deal in the papers about what is going on at the Conference at Algeciras. We should be glad if the Government could give us an assurance of progress made and any hope as to the future. We know that we entered the Conference as the friend of our great neighbour France, that as the friend of France we had accepted an agreement satisfactory to ourselves, and which we hoped other countries might be able to accept. If by diplomatic means we can in any way promote what we believe to be the just interests of France, I am sure it will be in accordance with the wishes of the whole country. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any Papers on the subject or any information to give. Also I should like to ask what progress is being made in Macedonia, in carrying out the financial argeement accepted some time ago by the Sultan We are aware that the agreement is now being put into force, and we shall be glad to know if there is any information as to whether it is proceeding satisfactorily.

Well, then in the paragraph of the Speech which deals with Colonial affairs, I cannot help thinking that those who have been connected with Colonial affairs would agree with me that there, also, continuity of policy is most desirable. This country has suffered in the past in its relations with the Colonies from a want of agreement in regard to that policy. I would say now that I sincerely hope that we may look forward under the present Government to a general continuity of the policy carried out by the previous Government. There is an announcement in the King's speech of an important change in the constitution of the Transvaal which was offered by the late Government. A new constitution is to be conferred on the Transvaal. The House knows how this matter stands. At the end of the war a promise was made that constitutional government would be conferred on the Transvaal at the earliest possible moment, that that should be followed by representative government, and that gradually it should lead up to responsible government. Well, the late Government started with a constitutional government but stopped for the moment at representative government. The form of government that they proposed was a very liberal one considering the circumstances. It must be remembered that never before or after a great war had a defeated party been so largely endowed with a share of the government as the people of the Transvaal were, even under the limited constitution proposed to be given them. Everybody admired the extraordinary magnanimity shown by the Northern States of America after the Civil War, but it was ten years before the Southern States obtained the full franchise and full share in the government of the United States. I do not give that as any reason. You may in a matter of this kind very well create a new precedent. It is as I say only a question of degree. Whatever you do, whether you give representative government or whether you give responsible government, it is necessarily an experiment, and time alone will show whether you are wise. When the form of government which has now been withdrawn was before the House, the Prime Minister and the Member for Poplar and one or two others who spoke, objected to it on the ground that it did not go far enough. They then proposed the policy which they are now in a position to adopt. All I want to say upon that point is that there is no precedent for so quick a grant to any colony of responsible government, and that it will considerably delay the constitution. The Speech hopes that it will be delayed for only a few months. I think that is rather sanguine. I think it may probably be twelve months before that constitution will be in working order, whereas the old constitution might have been in working order in three months. But this is a matter the responsibility of which lies with the Government of the day, who have more knowledge than we have, and they have to consider what it is safe to give. If this large grant of representative government turns out right, no one will be better pleased than we on this side of the House are. There is another point I want some information about. What is to be the electoral system? The Prime Minister will remember that in the debate to which I have referred the whole criticism was on the question of responsible and representative government. There was no complaint of the criticism of the electoral system and the Prime Minister himself approved of it. I believe he said that there were many good things in the constitution offered by the late Government, including the abolition of plural voting and the creation of electoral areas. The details have been unanimously approved by the whole British population in the Transvaal. We have no indication on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite that they have any objection to any part of that measure. I hope that there is no intention whatever to make anything in the nature of an important change in that constitution, and if there is any such intention I ask the Prime Minister, when he comes to reply, to say how and when that change is to be made. I come to another point which is of very great importance. Roughly speaking, we are going on for twelve months without this new constitution in the Transvaal, but meanwhile what is to happen in regard to Chinese labour? In the gracious Speech from the Throne we are assured that no more licences will be allowed. If it stops there I do not think that the facts and circumstances and conditions will be different from what they would have been if the late Government had continued to be in power, except that possibly a few more licences would have been granted. The question is this, that according to statements made by the mineowners the number of labourers they have got is as many as they require, provided that the number is kept up. Therefore, I say all that would have been necessary, supposing the late Government had still remained in power, would have been to have kept up about the number at present in the colony. The mineowners would not have taken any very large additional numbers. As regards the Chinese who are there and those who have got licences but have not yet arrived in South Africa, there is to be no change. Well, then, what is the condition of these men? There are 60,000 of them in the Transvaal at the present time and will be for the next twelve months. It is said that they are in a state of slavery and in chains. During the recent election I am afraid that I came into conflict with the Minister for Education, and in the course of a speech I made incidentally a remark in which I held him liable or responsible for certain posters and pamphlets issued by the Liberal Publication Department. The right hon. Member was good enough to say that that organisation was in no way responsible for pamphlets or posters involving an accusation of slavery. I at once accepted his denial of any knowledge of the posters or pamphlets; but since then I have received further information, and I think that the right hon. Gentleman has been mistaken or misinformed when he alleged that no one of these posters or pamphlets had been issued by the National Liberal Publication Department. Here is a picture which shows a certain number of Chinese walking with heads bowed down and with their hands behind their backs, much as I stand now. If the object of the placard was to represent that the Chinaman was as free and happy as myself, I do not know why it was circulated. I defy anyone to look at it and say that it was not intended to convey the idea and does not convey the idea that these men have their hands tied behind their backs and was not intended to represent a case of slavery. This is the only one which was distinctly published and issued by the National Liberal Federation, but here is one by The National Press Agency where the thing is carried a little farther, and where not only are these Chinamen represented with their hands behind their backs, but with ropes round their wrists, and they have chains or ropes connecting them neck to neck. Worst of all was a series of cartoons which represented the Chinamen not only in a state of slavery, but being subjected to horrible torture. Here is one where the Chinaman, a ghastly looking figure, is strung up by a rope round his wrists with his toes just touching the ground, and that is given as the sort of punishment to which they are subjected. These were the tortures which were endured in the middle ages and at this day they are in use in China itself. I am not referring to these cartoons in order to incriminate any particular association or any particular person or to fix responsibility upon any person for the publication of these documents. The culpability has got to be determined. It may be, I give you this advantage, if advantage it is, that it may be claimed that these documents are justifiable if the statements are true, but I do not think that in any case it would be in very good taste to circulate them in the course of a political fight, and I do not think that it was in very good taste that gentlemen should have on their platforms men dressed as Chinese chained together. That is a matter of opinion; but I understand that the gentlemen who provided all this literature do not now feel inclined to justify it. Now I want to point out this. It seems to me that the whole policy of right hon. Gentlemen in regard to this matter depends upon what is going on in South Africa. Remember, as far as we know the Government are going to do nothing. A short time ago Members of Parliament had pamphlets sent to them dealing with cruelties in the Congo. There is nothing worse in the description of the cruelties in the Congo than those which are alleged to be going on under the British flag in the Transvaal. That is this case. [Cries of "No."] Oh well, is this really a quibble whether one mode of torture under which the man dies after being hours under it is more or less a subject of suffering than another mode of torture under which he dies in a similar period? My point is this: this is represented as torture of the worst possible kind, which according to the papers to which I have referred, is going on in the Transvaal. I admit that those who accuse us believe that they correctly represent what is going on. [AN HON. MEMBER: Was going on.] I can understand that in the Congo or in the Transvaal and certainly in England a particular act of brutality and cruelty might be committed. I do not deny that something of that sort may take place whatever your regulations or provisions may be in any part of the British Dominions. I have known such things to go on in my experience as Secretary of State for the Colonies in some of our Colonies, but I think it will be believed that as soon as it came to my notice I took steps to stop it, as no doubt was the case with my prodecessors and will be the case with my successors. But this is not a separate case, because the letterpress says these are not singular or exceptional cases but that these cruelties go on as a rule. I am willing to assent to the proposition that those who during the election took advantage of these statements did so believing them to be true. If they did not believe them to be true and made use of them, I say that they were guilty of the grossest hypocrisy and dishonesty. Does the Government believe them to be true? That is the point. I hope the Prime Minister will give me a categorical answer to a question which I think all who are interested in this matter will agree to be a reasonable one. We have a right to know. Is slavery going on on the Rand now? We have a right to ask is slavery going on there, and is torture going on? We have also the right to ask, is the system such that torture and slavery are reasonably possible? Now there must be one of two answers to that question. If the answer is "No; it is not possible," then let us have it on official authority, and then let us tell the Members of Parliament who believe these things to be true how they have been deceived. But perhaps the Prime Minister may tell me "We believe it to be true." If it is true, how are you going to deal with it? How do you justify your inaction if indeed the Speech contains your policy in regard to this matter? [AN HON. MEMBER: It is not a case of inaction.] I do not think the hon. Member is yet on the Treasury Bench, and he is not in a position to answer the question, but the fact is that according to the statements widely circulated throughout the country, there are at the present moment some 60,000 of Chinese in British Africa who are subject to these tortures, and yet the Government is prepared to postpone indefinitely — at any rate for a considerable time—the granting of a constitution, and when that constitution is granted they propose apparently to hand over the whole matter to the new responsible government without inquiring further as to the condition of these people. I say you cannot do it; you will not be allowed to do it. I say if these things are going on you must deal with the matter now, and you have a majority which gives you all the power which you require. I say that if the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister has any suspicion that these practices are going on, he should tell us what provision he is going to make to prevent their being continued by any responsible Government which will also be under the British flag, how he is going to stop the possibility of anything of the kind in the future, and how is he going to punish the people who have been guilty of these crimes—because it is a crime, no doubt, and you have a right, if these tortures are being inflicted, to demand that those inflicting them should be punished with all severity. I desire to put to the Prime Minister this question in a definite form, Do the Government intend to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into what is going on under this system in South Africa? If they do intend to appoint one, what will be its position? What will be its procedure, and what will be the reference to it? If they have not decided to appoint a Commisison I will ask them to tell me as soon as they have. I am quite sure that for their own honour and the honour of this country they cannot allow this matter to go on without full inquiry, and I have no doubt that they will see that argument in its full strength. Then I come to a paragraph in the Speech which I think is quite unusual. I do not think that before the Speech from the Throne has contained so special a relation to the progress of imports and exports. We rejoice at any signs which point to an improvement in trade, although I thought at one time the Chancellor of the Exchequer declined to admit that the imports and exports were to be taken as evidence of the growth of trade [MR. ASQUITH dissented.] I thought that was so. We shall certainly recognise that as one element of the improvement in trade, in which we all rejoice. It is not the time to ask questions on this subject, although I may be ultimately permitted to do so of the Department concerned, the object of which questions will be to analyse these returns more closely than they have been hitherto, in the hope that such further information may enable us to understand how it is that this prosperity should be accompanied by a state of things in which one-third of the whole population are underfed and on the verge of hunger. ["No."] That is the post-election feeling, but the pre-election feeling was that one-third of the people of this country were underfed and hungry. ["No."] Then hon. Members asked for an autumn session to consider the subject, but now an allusion to it is considered to be matter for denial and laughter. At any rate we intend to pursue the inquiry whether you like it or not. We hope to get this information, and I hope to discover from it, if, as we believe and have never denied, wealth is continually accumulating, why it is that men decay. If more and more wealth is constantly added to, why is it that distribution appears to be so uneven? After this interlude the Speech goes on to what will be the most interesting topics to many here present; it gives us the bill of fare for the session. No one can complain of the quantity, although even here there is a curious, I do not know whether it is an intentional, omission. Why is nothing said about temperance? I have looked at a great number of addresses of members, and I find that temperance has a prominent place in all of them. I find that in their speeches Liberal candidates blamed the late Government for making a present of two millions of money to the publicans and brewers, and that this is going on, and that of all reforms the most urgent was one which would stimulate the sobriety of the people. But why is there no mention of the subject in the Speech?

It might be said, of course, that the Government have not the time to do everything, but most Governments that I have known have thought they had. The present Government seems to have the wisdom to take its legislation in doses; but why has this question, which was stated to be the most urgent and most important of all questions, not even been mentioned? Why is it not even given a back place? The first place in the constructive policy of the Government appears to be given to Ireland. Certainly the sentence in the Speech which deals with Ireland is a little enigmatical, although we are much indebted to the hon. Member for the Richmond Division for the light he has thrown upon it. The Government, it appears, are going to introduce "means for associating the people"—that is the Irish people—"with the conduct of Irish affairs." Are they not associated now? [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] Their position is the same now as it is in England. In fact, they have a much larger representation. Irishmen count for about two or three Englishmen, and to that extent they have a great advantage over us. They have substantially equal rights with regard to their representation in this House and in every form of local government. I say, then, it seems to me inaccurate to omit reference to that. It is something more than that which the Speech promises, and I should be very glad if we can have any information whether this is, in fact, the Home Rule which we were led to believe is under no circumstances to be introduced into the present Parliament. If not that, is it that other something which we have never had clearly defined, but which is to lead up to the "larger policy"? All we have to say is, and it will not be any surprise to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, that to any policy of that kind, whether it be in the way of compromise or in the way of direct Home Rule, we shall give, as we have always given——

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Did you ever read the Radical programme?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The most unrelenting hostility. Reference has been made by an interruption to the Radical programme. You will bear in mind that that programme, which refers to about the year 1884 or 1885, consisted entirely of a policy to take the place of the local government for Ireland which was subsequently adopted. I say that at that time I would have gone further than I would go now. At that time a proposal was on foot which had the support of Mr. Parnell and the leaders of the Irish Nationalist Party in this House and of the hierarchy in Ireland, and which therefore had some chance of being accepted as a settled policy, and as having some finality about it. If any one goes now to any policy of that kind, and I am curious to know to what extent the Government will follow in my steps, all I can say is that it will do so under totally different circumstances, and they cannot pretend that they have any assurance from hon. Gentlemen who represent the Nationalist Party that anything of that kind will be accepted as anything more than a step leading to something of more importance. The Government appear to have withdrawn from operation certain provisions of the Crimes Act. I take it for granted that they see no danger in that withdrawal, no fear of any failure of order in Ireland; and in that case we shall be very glad to know that the time has come when Ireland can be governed without even the appearance of exceptional legislation. If that is so they will probably have received reports from the police or the Judges, and I presume they have no objection to lay those reports on the Table. Then there is a new regulation in connection with the sales of estates in Ireland. I assume there will be no objection to lay it on the Table. We understand from the Papers that free grants to evicted tenants have been made on a larger scale than ever before and under different conditions. I should like to know whether the conditions under which they are granted can be laid on the Table and what source the money is to come from. I always understood that the money in the hands of the Estates Commissioners was insufficient to carry out the operations of the Act, and this is placing a new charge upon us before the old one has been satisfied. While all this is being done for the Irish tenants, what is going to be done for the British farmer? Something considerable has been done for the Irish farmer who cannot or will not pay his rent; what is to be done for the British farmer who can and does pay his rent? The only reference I can find to that is in another rather enigmatical expression in the Speech where we are told that "inquiries are proceeding as to the means by which a larger number of the population may be attracted to and retained on the soil." Who is making the inquiries? Is it an official inquiry? We shall be glad to know also the terms of reference to the committee or commission appointed. I have read the long list of Bills with great interest. The first Bill taken, I presume, will be the Education Bill. I would say with regard to most of the promised Bills, and especially the Education Bill and the Labour Bill, that we, on this side, approve of the avowed objects. There is no doubt about that, and we shall approach their consideration sympathetically, and if they are conceived in a spirit of moderation and justice, we shall certainly be glad to give to the furtherance of those measures any assistance in our power. As regards education, I understand there is to be no fundamental change in our system of education so far as secular instruction is concerned. The great point, I take it, will be what is called the religious difficulty. I am not prepared to say that there is no grievance under the existing system. At the proper time I shall say that the last Act lessened the grievance, but it is not necessary to argue that to-night. As I admit there is still a grievance, so there is, at all events, ground for the introduction of a new Bill; and the only thing I have to do is to put in a plea beforehand that the Bill shall not take away a grievance from one set of shoulders and put it on to other shoulders, that it shall be a Bill equally applicable to all, treating one sect as fairly and justly as another. I may venture to say that such a result, so far as I can see, can only be found in giving larger control to the parents to decide what religious instruction their children shall receive. The Labour Bill, although not revolutionary in title, points to considerable increase in expenditure—and I would further mention in a parenthesis that I do not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer will ever find the money which he requires for this policy of social reform, and especially for such a scheme as old-age pensions, unless he is able to widen very much more than I think he will be under the present system the basis of taxation. He is precluded from doing so. The Prime Minister said the other night, "free trade had carried all before it, he trusted, once for all." If I may be allowed to substitute "free imports," then I will agree with him that free imports appeared to carry all before them at the last election; but he would be very short-sighted—and I know he is not—if he thinks he has heard the last of tariff reform. We believe that tariff reform is closely connected with this great question of the condition of the people. Do what you like, and say what you may, it will be continually cropping up in one form or another. At any rate we remember what happened when Cobden carried his proposals. He did not carry them all at once. He went through many defeats in the Parliaments in which he sat; and it was not for a long period—seven or eight years, I think—after he started the agitation that he was able to congratulate himself on his success. We will not be more cowardly than he was, we will not be more discouraged than he was by defeat; and when at length you have failed to satisfy the expectations you have created, when the issues change, when the people once more desire a change of Government, then you will find that we have lost none of our activity, none of our conscientious belief in the necessity and justice of our cause.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no complaint to make, neither have any of my friends behind me, as to the general tone of the right hon. Gentleman this evening. He has quoted the words which I had attributed to him, and has rather disclaimed the interpretation put upon them. But if he looks at the speeches he has been making since the result of the general election, or since its result had become apparent, I think he will find that he did give utterance to the words, namely, that he and his friends might leave the propagation of his peculiar fiscal views to operations outside, and devote themselves in this House to the ordinary work—I am quoting roughly—of an Opposition, which is to harass the Government. The right hon. Gentleman has not harassed us very much to-night. He has asked a number of perfectly pertinent questions in a forcible manner, and I trust that I shall be able to answer all his questions, if not with entire satisfaction to him, at all events to the satisfaction of the majority of the Members of the House. The right hon. Gentleman was, I think, a little hard upon my hon. friend the mover of the Address. He covered with praise my hon. friend the seconder, but drew a distinction between him and the mover. I venture to say that it was entirely undeserved. The only reason I can find for it is that the mover of the Address, carried away, no doubt, a little from the ordinary practice by the extraordinary circumstances of the late election, made some strenuous observations regarding that particular policy with which the right hon. Gentleman himself has been so much identified. But I would say that, having heard now more movers and seconders than I like to count up, I have seldom if ever heard the difficult duty performed with greater success and by men more qualified and more justified in moving such a Motion. The mover of the Address has had a long experience of metropolitan government. He is one of the most distinguished of that singular series of capable men whom the new government of London has furnished us with. He therefore comes to this House on an occasion when London has executed such a marvellous change in its political opinion as represented in this House as one who can speak on behalf of London with peculiar emphasis.

I associate myself with the right hon. Gentleman in welcoming the seconder, for, like the right hon. Gentleman, I have known his grandfather and his father in this House; and we all rejoice to know that the family is not yet extinct either in its individual members or in its capacity for public work. The right hon. Gentleman moralised a little on the general election. He did it very well, because he did not attempt to disguise or hide in any way the seriousness of the overturn of opinion it indicated. But the right hon. Gentleman treated it in a somewhat lighthearted, though certainly in a stout-hearted, way. The right hon. Gentleman referred to a question which I see sometimes exercises the minds of the curious, namely, the disproportion that exists between the majority of the votes given at the poll and the majority of Members returned to the House. He is not aware probably—and I believe it to be a fact, however remarkable it may be—that on this occasion it is less than it has been on any other occasion. Certainly it is very much less great than it was in the election with which he was himself concerned, namely, the celebrated khaki election. But he accepts the situation, and in that he is right. The right hon. Gentleman looks forward to a time when he and his friends will be in power again. The mustard and cress which were planted by the ingenious writer and politician whom the right hon. Gentleman quoted no doubt came up very lightly and very rapidly, but they did not last very long; and the expectations and hopes of the right hon. Gentleman may be liable to perish like the mustard and cress. Doubtless the right hon. Gentleman will indulge year after year in fresh planting and fresh hopes, but I hope he may be exhausted finally before the fruition of his hopes is attained. The right hon. Gentleman followed the King's Speech in its course. He associated himself with the paragraphs referring to the lamentable death of the King of Denmark and the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to India The very fact that those paragraphs are in the King's Speech, for which I with others am responsible, dispenses with the necessity of my dwelling upon those subjects. The right hon. Gentleman asked what progress was being made with the Conference at Algeciras. When I come for the first time to a question of foreign affairs, perhaps I may say to the House that, in the lamentable circumstances in which my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary stands, it will not be surprised that he shrinks in some measure from a public appearance in the House; and therefore hon. Members must not expect such full information on these subjects for a day or two as he would have been otherwise anxious to give them. But as far as we know matters are proceeding satisfactorily—slowly, but satisfactorily. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of our relations to the nation and the Government of France. They remain exactly what they were. We are giving the French Government all the diplomatic support in our power; and we are giving it without the slightest prejudice, not only to our perfect amity, but great good will, to all the other Powers that may be concerned. It is right for the people of this country that it should be stated again and again, and as emphatically as possible, that the understanding we have with France remains as strongly intrenched as it was when it was first established, that it has no sinister purpose towards any other nation or Government, and that we merely wish to find in it a means of strengthening that good and almost affectionate feeling between France and Great Britain which we are all anxious to encourage. As to Macedonia, I am afraid that I must refer the right hon. Gentleman and other hon. Members to my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary when he reappears. I now turn to a matter with which the right hon. Gentleman has himself been concerned, namely, the question of colonial affairs. The right hon. Gentleman is in favour of continuity of policy in colonial as well as in foreign affairs. So am I. I have always accepted the doctrine with a reservation, because otherwise every Government that came into power would be bound to go on with a policy which in its heart and conscience might be thought a bad policy. I would be opposed as strongly as the right hon. Gentleman to any wanton change for the sake of change merely; but to say that, because an outgoing Government leaves a public question connected with the Colonies or foreign States in a certain position, the incoming Government has not a free hand to deal with the position is to say a thing which would be destructive of the proper management of the nation's affairs. The right hon. Gentleman refers to the announcement that we propose to erect a constitution in the Transvaal embodying full and responsible Government instead of the intermediate stage of representative Government. I will tell him exactly how that stands. First of all, let me say that we have high authority for what we are doing. We have the authority of the right hon. Gentleman himself, who only a short time ago—in August, 1903—said that one thing was clear, namely, that the population of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, both Boer and Briton, by a large majority desired this self-government, even though it might seem to us to be premature and unwise. The right hon. Gentleman also said that he did not believe there was any danger to Imperial interests to cause us to hesitate to accord it; the point was the interest of the two colonies themselves. So it cannot be on any high ground of imperial necessity that the right hon. Gentleman demurs, if he does demur, and I do not understand that he does, to the extension of self-governing powers to the Transvaal to the length of what is called responsible Government. But I think what has weighed with us principally is this, first of all there was a movement of opinion—he refers to the feeling of the people—there has been lately a strong movement of opinion in South Africa, so far as we can gather, in favour of responsible Government. In the second place, experience has proved in the past that an intermediate stage has not been favourable, but the reverse. We have more than once thought we were doing well in the history of our Colonies, when we gave to a particular colony what is called a representative Government, by which I understand a system of creating a representative body, but which does not give that representative body full power over its own affairs. We have introduced an intermediate system of that sort on several occasions, thinking it would be as it were a schoolmaster to bring the colony to a proper sense of the use of full powers, but it has been found to be exactly the reverse, to work in the exactly opposite direction, to breed friction and dissension between the governors and the governed, and to create sectional differences in the population, and I believe myself it is safer and better in every way to give responsible government at once, and that that therefore is the best form of education, if education is wanted, to which the population of a colony can be subjected. Then the right hon. Gentleman says, On what basis is your responsible system of government to be founded? Is it to be on what is called one man one vote, or how is it to be, or is it to be one vote one value, and so forth, as was the representative system proposed by the late Government? On that we have an open mind, and it is precisely on these questions—questions as to how people may be affected by a policy—it is on that subject generally that we find ourselves woefully in want of information and therefore must make further inquiry. What we are doing now is not finding some way out of the difficulty of Chinese labour or anything else. Let the House remember we are now giving a system of Government to these two colonies which is to be a permanent system, and our great desire is to avoid anything that has the appearance of being unfair either to one section of the community or another, one race or another, either the agricultural or the urban element. I believe that anything done at this moment that even had attributed to it that it was done from a party motive or with a view to obtain some artificial unity, would leave behind it a root of bitterness which might be fatal to the prosperity and progress of the colony. Our policy—I put it shortly—is to do the right thing as between all the different interests, and we are not yet in a position to judge what the effect of different arrangements on the community, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case as they now stand, would be. Therefore it is, instead of applying a scheme which had been promoted for a representative system to a full responsible system of government, we think the wisest thing we can do is to take time, in order to have a thorough inquiry—the particular form or particular method by which we should obtain our information we have not yet determined upon—and then we shall be in a better position to act upon this difficult and important matter and be certain, so far as human certainty exists, that we shall not be doing harm to the future of the country. We must remember also that it is not the Transvaal alone that we are dealing with. We have the Orange River Colony to deal with, and we look forward ultimately, without forcing it in any way, to the federation of South Africa. Therefore we may look at it that everything we do for one of the colonies of that country we do for all; and it is on that ground we are obliged, much to our regret, to postpone the completion of the new system, and can only say we will make it as shortly as it is possible for us to do. Let me say this, there is one very small point. The right hon. Gentleman repeated what I have seen in newspapers or speeches—he has repeated the assertion that in a debate last summer I myself actually approved of this individual system of one vote one value, and rather approved than found fault with the constitution proposed. I think if the right hon. Gentleman looks to what I have said he will find there was some little degree of irony in all I said which rather neutralised the effect of Clause 5. I thought it was a good point to make for the purpose of harassing the Government. I was contrasting these proposals of the Unionist Government for the Transvaal with the Redistribution Bill for England which at the same time the Government were promoting, and I pointed out one or two things which constituted a difference, and expressed in what I thought was an ironical way how it was that out of the same Government there should come two such different constitutions. That is the explanation of the words he quoted. Now, of course, we are well aware of the serious effect of this on the question of Chinese labour. Let me say with regard to Chinese labour—I do not wish to put myself forward—but last summer I said, and I adhere to the statement, that the question whether Chinese labour should be introduced into South Africa as a part of the industrial system was a question not for us, but for the inhabitants of South Africa and of the particular colony concerned—a question to be referred to them as soon as their opinions could be authoritatively collected. But when I said that the question of Chinese labour or no Chinese labour was to be so referred, I by no means inferred that the question of the conditions under which Chinese labour was to be allowed was a matter of indifference to the people of this country and to the Empire at large, or that it was to be referred to the people of the particular colony in question. The right hon. Gentleman produced certain cartoons and asked, Did we approve of these cartoons or not? I can only say that I have not seen them. [OPPOSITION Cries of "Oh."] In Scotland there are two things we do not use—at least never in my constituency. One is cartoons and the other is colours. We elect Members because of their opinions. Even my friends and countrymen below the gangway will confirm my statement in that respect, although they think there is some virtue in a tie. The right hon. Gentleman cannot deny that the conditions imposed in the Ordinance are servile conditions. He asks me, Is it slavery or is it not? I say that these conditions are servile conditions, and that many of these conditions are more than servile—they are either cruel in themselves or lead readily to the perpetration of cruelty. The right hon. Gentleman puts his hands behind his back, and asks whether the Chinese coolie is as free as he is. Of course he is not. The right hon. Gentleman is not liable to be shut up at night or to be prevented from engaging in business or from settling, after his contract is out, in the country in which he lives. There are all kinds of respects in which he is free and in which the coolie is not. But we have all sorts of evidence of irregularities. One of the evidences is the despatch of Mr. Lyttelton to Lord Selborne, dated October 24th last, in which he says:—

> "It appears that the inquiries consequent upon the various breaches of the peace which occurred in May brought to light the fact that this permission to officials to inflict slight corporal punishment had been abused. The Lieutenant-Governor accordingly cancelled the permission in June last. I understand from you that since then the practice has been entirely stopped; but your statement, which reached me at the end of August, was the first intimation which I received from the Colonies that official permission for any corporal punishment had been given."

That is one of the evils of the system. You import a number of men who are accustomed, I dare say, to acts of cruelty in their own country. Your own officials gradually come to regard those acts as being quite in the regular line of business, and so the whole thing becomes more and more intense, until at last you may arrive at a state of flagrant cruelty. Mr. Lyttelton went on to say that he, by the time he had received this information from Lord Selborne, knew arrangements for maintaining order and discipline in the mines had been drawn up by him and the amending Ordinance for giving effect to them was under discussion, and he concluded by saying—

> "I profoundly regret that corporal punishment, however slight, was authorised without the safeguards of the law, and that the matter was not brought to my notice as Secretary of State for the Colonies before it was authorised."

If Mr. Lyttelton, even in this moderate way, rebuked those on the spot for the way in which they allowed discipline to be conducted in the mines, I think that it is no wonder that we should take the same view and entertain it in an even stronger degree. Sir, as I say, we desire the question of the employment of Chinese labour to be decided by the people of the colony when they have received full responsible government. In the meantime His Majesty's Government feel it their duty, so long as any responsibility rests with them for the administration of the Ordinances, to secure as far as possible that no Chinese coolie who honestly and genuinely desires to return permanently to his home shall be detained in the Transvaal against his will or from want of means. Clause 14 in every contract between an employer and a coolie provides that the labourer may at any time, without assigning any reason, return to his own country on tendering to the employer the expenses incurred in introducing him into the Transvaal, together with a sum sufficient to defray the expenditure necessary to return him to the port from which he embarked. His Majesty's Government intend that the labourer who wishes to avail himself of this power of repatriation shall not be deterred from doing so by lack of the necessary funds. They regret that no provision was made in the Ordinance for throwing part at least of the cost in such cases on the importers. But in the circumstances they think it right that, where the desire of the labourer to be permanently repatriated can be proved to be genuine by a reasonable length of notice and by such other tests as a full consideration of the matter may seem to render necessary, the cost shall be met from public funds. This will make it impossible that any labourer really desirous of repatriation shall be retained in the Transvaal against his will. Another point is this. Under the Ordinance of 1905, amending the original Ordinance of 1904, legal sanction is given to certain judicial and punitive methods which His Majesty's Government cannot approve. These will not be allowed to remain in force, and the Government will decide without delay on the best and promptest way of securing their withdrawal.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can make it clear what punitive regulations they are of which he does not approve?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In the Ordinance of last autumn there were provisions allowing certain modes of punishment and allowing trials to be conducted, I think, in the mines by the mine people, without any recourse to the ordinary courts. That is how we stand. In a sense we have no responsibility for Chinese labour. We opposed it from the first. We inherited it from the right hon. Gentlemen on the other side. There are many cases where an evil having been done, or an evil practice established, it is impossible, without a possibly greater evil almost, to put an end to it abruptly. What we are going to do, at all events, is to give the coolie who has a genuine and honest wish to go home, the power to do so, and to do away at the same time with what seemed to be—I will not use so strong a word as iniquitous—but an unusual, or illegal practice. By removing this, we, at all events, do something to mitigate the evil which we and our friends have so loudly and so strongly protested against.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman does not intend, then, to interfere with those regulations which keep the Chinese to the compounds.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Of course, if you introduce a number of Chinese into the country under certain conditions, and the people will not have them going about loose, you have to keep them in a compound.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I beg the right hon. Gentleman to understand I am not criticising or arguing; I am only asking for information so that we may know exactly what the Government is doing.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think I have already explained. We attach great importance to the leave given to any man who dislikes his life to go home to his own country. The right hon. Gentleman said he would bring up the subject at a later period in order to suggest to us that we should appoint a Royal Commission. We have considered that, but not very fully, but I promise him that it shall be considered. He knows as well as we the delicacy of the whole matter, and how difficult it is to take what is, in common parlance, called a strong line of action, because you often raise difficulties which you do not contemplate at first. We propose to do what we can to take as much as possible the cruelty and servile conditions out of the life, and at the same time give those who dislike the life an opportunity to escape from it. The right hon. Gentleman said a few words on free trade. Well, this great question does not stand even as a general election left it, because an event has happened this week. The right hon. Gentleman said we must all be sorry that the late First Lord of the Treasury is not in his place. I should be rather hypocritical if I professed to be sorry under the circumstances in which he ceased to be in his place. I should of course personally be glad to see him, but the right hon. Gentleman knows quite well that we are not bound either to desire or facilitate the return to the House of a right hon. Gentleman who is so entirely opposed to us in political opinions. I am reminded of the passage of time, and I will deal with the question on another occasion. A friend of mine is going to ask for a day to discuss this question of free trade and protection, in order that we may have a full statement or a re-statement of the arguments for and against, with the additional light and assistance which may be given by the right hon. Gentleman, and, possibly, the late Prime Minister, if he elects to take part in that discussion. Last session complaint was made that we did not get opportunities of discussing the question; now we shall have them. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will be glad of that, because he is not one who leads his battalions out of the House. Then there is temperance. The right hon. Gentleman says that we are not dealing with temperance. How could we deal with it in a session when we have such large questions as education, the workmen's question and the social question? I believe that temperance is the keystone, or the cornerstone, in the edifice of the prosperity of this country. We are best serving it by not making an attempt to meddle with it this year, when it is extremely unlikely that there will be time enough to deal with it. As to Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman asks what the meaning is of associating the Irish with the conduct of affairs, and he says, are they not associated now with the conduct of affairs. Well, they were not when the right hon. Gentleman compared them with Russia and Poland. Now, he says, you have got local government, and therefore you can do without giving them more. But the giving of local government is the very reason why you cannot refuse that the Irish should have a larger share in the management of their own affairs. We have the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and even the new Irish Member for South Dublin, giving local affairs to the Irish people, and endowing them with millions upon millions of British credit, thereby showing the trust that they have in them. Therefore I claim that they themselves should welcome rather than oppose the larger system of associating the Irish people with the conduct of their own affairs.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth. :—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign*,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) continuing his speech, said: I was speaking about Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman asked me what various things meant—particularly "means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs." Well, Sir, I cannot better explain that than in the words that were used by the late Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland shortly after his arrival in Ireland, who said—

> "There were those who seemed to believe that the only way in which a great Empire could be sucessfully maintained was by suppressing the various distinguishing elements in it; in fact, by running it as a huge regiment in which each nation was to lose its own individuality and to be brought under a common system of discipline." "That," said the noble Lord, "was not his view. That was more likely to break up the Empire. The opinion of the Government —of the late Government, mark you—was that the only way to govern Ireland properly was to govern it according to Irish ideas instead of according to British ideas."

That is my view and the view of the present Government. The right hon. Gentleman has further asked about the removal of certain conditions of the Crimes Act, and asked that the reports of the police and Judges should be laid upon the Table. I believe that has never been done. It is easy to see why. We on this side of the House have again and again protested against the Crimes Act altogether. I can understand exceptional laws, but I do not like them. This is an exceptional law of perpetual character — If I may use the expression — rather in accordance with the general policy of the late Government, who wished to have a pistol in their hands in order to terrify foreign nations, whose tariffs were objectionable to them, and it was their policy to have this pistol in their hands to discharge at the Irish people directly they made themselves obnoxious to that Government. We have always regarded this pistol held in perpetuity at the head of the Irish people as objectionable. We have voted again and again for the repeal of that Act. I am prepared to do so again, not necessarily this session, but when the proper occasion arises that certainly will be our policy. Then the right hon. Gentleman asked me questions as to certain grants to evicted tenants. They were given under existing Acts and in accordance with legal decisions. "What is to be done for the British farmer?" further asks the right hon. Gentleman. If he waits he will see we are going to do as much as we can. We cannot do everything at once. When the right hon. Gentleman asks what is the meaning of the mysterious inquiry now going on, I reply that the Departmental Committee was appointed by the late Government under the Chairmanship of the Earl of Onslow, than whom there are few men better qualified to be Chairman, and with the present President of the Board of Agriculture as a member, to inquire into the best means of extending and developing the Small Holdings Act. That Act has been unprolific hitherto. The Committee is expected to report in the summer, and on that account, putting aside the pressure of other matters, we cannot attempt legislation now, although that is a matter which certainly presses for attention. As to the farmer and the agricultural labourer, I trust we shall be able, if the House supports us, to do much when we have had time to consider what steps are most necessary, and when we have a reasonable opportunity of passing legislation. The right hon. Gentleman need be under no apprehension that we shall neglect the British farmer and agricultural labourer. Education, to which the right hon. Gentleman also referred, will, of course, be the principal subject which we shall at once undertake. I cannot pledge myself that it will be the first Bill to be brought before the House, because circumstances may necessitate that a Bill of less complexity and importance should be brought in before it. I was glad to hear, however, the general tone of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks on the subject. We are anxious to get rid of the religious difficulty, but do not let it be imagined that the only culprits are those who complain of the existing system; the patrons of that system are just as much promoters of the religious difficulty, and more so, than those who protest against it. I now return to the subject of free trade, upon which I have a word or two to say. It has taken a new phase in the last week, thanks to the energy and opportunity of the right hon. Gentleman. What we have been trying vainly for the last two or three years to get at has at last apparently been disclosed. We have now a new "half-sheet of paper." The correspondence which has been published is very instructive. It was between the right hon. Gentleman and Mr. Balfour, of whom we can speak by his name now that he is suspended between heaven and earth. Mr. Balfour says, and the right hon. Gentleman agrees, that fiscal reform is and must remain the first constructive work of the future Parliament in which the Unionist Party is to have a majority—if the mustard and cress grows. Well, there is the Unionist Party, and I want to know what are they going to construct? Mr. Balfour says—

> "The establishment of a moderate general tariff on manufactured goods and the imposition of a small duty on foreign corn are not in principle objectionable, and should be adopted if necessary for the attainment of the general object in view."

That is entirely new. One of the most recent authoritative statements of the late Government was made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Akers-Douglas) in the absence of Mr. Balfour, in the debate on the Address on February 15, 1904, upon an Amendment moved by my right hon. friend the Member for Montrose. Many Members now in the House will remember the scene. After all the speeches were over, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—whom, politics apart, I am very sorry to miss from here—rose and asked a question—

> "Is the Government opposed to the taxation of food as proposed by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham? I understand that that proposal is not part of the Government policy, but I beg to ask whether the Government is or is not opposed to that proposal."

This was the anxious inquirer thinking he would get a ready answer, and so he did. But a question was further put by Sir Lees Knowles, who also, unfortunately, has not been returned. He asked—

> "Are the Government opposed to a duty on food or raw material."

to which the representative of the Government replied—

> "I have said that the Government are opposed to any duty on raw material or food."

That was the answer given then, on which votes depended. And now it appears that—

> "There is nothing in principle objectionable in a small duty on foreign corn, and it should be adopted if shown to be necessary."

I do not complain of a change of opinion; a reasonable change of opinion is perhaps rather a good sign. But I do object to a change of opinion suddenly disclosed as this has been. Last session there was no disclosure. We tried; we knocked at every door that we could find. On the eve of the election there was no disclosure. During the election there was no disclosure. But the disclosure came, the vital, and fatal announcement was made the day before a meeting which was to determine the future policy and the Leadership of the Opposition. In the absence of Mr. Balfour there is only one person who can thoroughly enlighten us on this subject. I have often said publicly that he is never backward in giving us the fullest information according to his own knowledge. It is true he is not the Leader of the Opposition, but it is he who leads the Leader of the Opposition. He knows what is in Mr. Balfour's mind; he has given it his *imprimatur*. In the course of the debate which I have promised him shall occur pretty early, he can say how the grand constructive work of destroying free trade, to which the energies of his Party are now to be devoted, is to be commenced at this auspicious moment when free trade has been endorsed and approved by the vast majority of the people of the country. That is the present position, as I understand it, of this fiscal question. I do not argue about it or enter into the merits of it in the least; I merely make a recital of facts which are known to us all, and which even the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman cannot explain away—which I do not believe he wishes to explain away. However, I trust there will be such an opportunity offered to us within the next day or two; and, so far from the right hon. Gentleman's being entitled to express surprise that there are some words in the King's Speech which appear to have some reference more or less remote to the question of imports and exports, and therefore to this subject, the only marvel to me is that His Majesty has been advised to refrain altogether from making a much more direct reference to this great controversy and to the extraordinary decision which has been come to upon it by the people of the country.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): No one who is at all acquainted with the character or history of the Irish question will be surprised if I seize the earliest opportunity afforded to me of bringing that question before the attention of the present House of Commons. This is a new Parliament. As I understand there are close upon 300 new Members of this House who have never heard the Irish question stated on the floor of the House of Commons. The Party whose *raison d'être* was opposition to the Irish question on the basis of self-government has been swept out of existence, and the Party which has been publicly pledged for twenty years to a settlement of the question on the basis of self-government has been returned to power by an overwhelming majority. Furthermore, this question of Ireland in the recent elections was in the very forefront of the issues which were submitted to the electors. It was placed before the electors in the speeches of the Prime Minister at Stirling and in the Albert Hall, but I do not dwell on that, although I would be correct in my statement even if I had nothing more to say. Surely the question of Ireland was placed before the electors of this country in the most dramatic and sensational way any issue was ever placed before the electors of England by the action of Lord Rosebery, because he declared that the Home Rule flag had been raised and that he refused to serve under that flag. Lord Rosebery forthwith disappeared altogether from the controversy and the discussion connected with the General Election. But it does not rest even there, because the late Prime Minister, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and everyone of the late Ministers of the Crown, and I am bound to say every Unionist candidate in Great Britain, put this question in the very forefront of the issues before the country. What did the late Prime Minister say? On the very eve of the East Manchester election he said—

> "I assert that Home Rule is the great dividing line between the two Parties in the

State in spite of any assertion to the contrary. I fail to see who is going to limit the power of the new Parliament in this matter, or how the Government is going to exclude Home Rule, even in its largest form, from the consideration of the House."

Was that not placing the issue of Ireland before the electors? When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was speaking on the 2nd of January last he said—

> "I cannot understand how any of my friends should ever have supposed that the Prime Minister could have come into power without standing by the programme to which he has given emphatic assent on many previous occasions as to Home Rule. I only say that because I wish you to understand that Home Rule is raised in an effective manner in this election."

It will be in the recollection of the House that the right hon. Gentleman went further in one of his speeches, and adopted as his own a phrase used by a newspaper in Ireland, which I may say was a paraphrase of a statement which the right hon. Gentleman made during the 1900 election, that every vote given for the Liberals was a vote for the Boers. The statement was that every vote given for Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was a vote for Home Rule. Mr. Gerald Balfour in his address used these words—

> "The two main questions overshadowing all other are Home Rule and fiscal reform."

And the London *Times* the day, I think, before the Manchester election said—

> "There can be no shadow of question that Home Rule is an issue at the general election of 1906."

I start therefore from this fact, that not only is the Party which has been openly pledged to Home Rule for twenty years, now in power, but from the fact that that issue was placed—not matter whether any individual desired it not to be so placed—by the Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, the late Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and the whole of the Unionist Party, before the electors. The result is that the Party which has been twenty years pledged to Home Rule has come back into power with an unprecedented majority. Therefore I respectfully say to the House of Commons that it is right and proper that at the earliest possible moment this question should be raised. What is the Irish question of which I have been speaking? I respectfully say to the House that it is the greatest of all Imperial questions which can concern or which can command the attention of English statesmanship. It is the most urgent of all Imperial questions. The present condition of Ireland is the greatest disgrace to this Empire. It is the greatest danger to this Empire. It is the greatest obstacle to the efficiency of this Parliament, and let me say to the new English Members on the other side of the House who have come here full of enthusiasm for reforms for this country, reforms which are needed by the people, that it means the existence at your doors here, at the very heart of the Empire, of an Ireland poverty stricken and disaffected. Does any one doubt that? And does any one who recognises the fact doubt its meaning or minimise its consequences? Judged by every test that the wit of man can devise, the government of Ireland by this country under the Act of Union has been a failure.

Now I desire to place this case before the House of Commons anew. Let me take some of those great tests. What greater test of good government and progress in a country is there to be found than its population? All over the Empire you are proud of the fact that population has increased. In Ireland the population has declined. Since 1841 the population of Ireland has diminished by 50 per cent. In 1845 Ireland had three times as many people as Scotland; Ireland had half as many people as England; Ireland had a third of the population of the whole United Kingdom. But in sixty years the population of Ireland has gone down by 4,000,000. Is there in the whole history of the world a parallel to that awful tragedy? We in Ireland have emerged within the last few weeks, I hope for ever, from what the late Lord Salisbury called twenty years of resolute government. In those twenty years of resolute government the population of Ireland went down by almost 1,000,000. And what is the character of the emigration? That is a greater tragedy still. Ninety per cent. of those who emigrated from Ireland were between the ages of ten and forty-five. That means that all those in the prime of life are leaving the country, and accounts for the fact, which English tourists often notice, that there are more little children and old men and women to be seen in Ireland than in any country in Europe. Of the 90 per cent., how many remain in the Empire at all? Why, nearly every man who emigrates from Ireland is a loss to the Empire; 87 per cent. of the whole emigration from Ireland goes to the United States—that is to say, that the young men and young women, physically and mentally vigorous, not only are lost to Ireland, but are lost to the Empire, and constitute a power in America, as everyone who is acquainted with the circumstances knows, which is a danger to this country and which undoubtedly is the chief bar in the way of a thorough amicable understanding between America and England. Those who have followed closely the progress of the Irish movement in recent years have, no doubt, read with interest the remarkable pamphlet and speeches of Lord Dunraven. He is a great Irish landlord, and has been all his life a Unionist, and is so to-day. He openly declares himself a Unionist, and I commend his statements on this point of the decay of Ireland as statements wrung from a Unionist by the hard facts of the case. Take another test besides population. In one of his pamphlets Lord Dunraven deals with this test, and it is an awful condemnation of your rule of Ireland. Lunacy in Ireland has steadily increased. To-day out of every 10,000 of the population 52·6 are lunatics or imbeciles. In England and Wales the proportion is only 34·7. Lunacy in Ireland since 1851 has doubled. It is true that under your rule it has been the survival of the unfittest in Ireland. All the young people mentally and physically strong go away, while the mentally and physically weak and decrepit remain behind, and you have the awful result in the tale of the unparalleled increase of lunacy which has gone on. Take the birth rate, which in Ireland is the lowest in Europe, namely, 23·5 per 1,000 at the present moment. In England it is 34·7, and in Scotland 31·7; and Lord Dunraven in one of his pamphlets publishes a most remarkable table showing that in Hungary, Roumania, Russia, Prussia, Italy, Denmark, Belgium, and Switzerland the birth-rate is far higher than it is in Ireland. There is another test of an equally tragic character. The serious forms of disease, such as consumption and cancer, are spread in Ireland with alarming rapidity such as cannot be found in any other country. They are diminishing in other countries; in Ireland they are spreading. I attribute these awful facts largely to the unsatisfactory condition in which the mass of the Irish people live, and to the poor and unwholesome food which alone they are able to obtain. Take pauperism. One person out of every 100 in Ireland is at the present moment the inmate of a workhouse. One person out of every forty-four in Ireland is in receipt of poor relief. During the years from 1863 to 1903 the number of paupers per 1,000 of the population in Ireland has doubled. During the same period the proportion of paupers in England has been diminished by one half. Do English Members, especially those of them who represent great centres of industry, ever reflect for a moment how this Irish poverty reacts upon their country and their constituents? Why, you passed with a great flourish of trumpets last year an Aliens Bill for the purpose of saving British workmen from the competition of alien labour. But I would like to ask English Members for the great centres of industry in this country how much of the want of employment of English workmen is due to the competition of Irish labour? The only way that you can save yourself from that competition is by making Ireland a country where men can live and thrive and find work, and in that way alone and not by your Alien Immigration laws, will you be able to deal effectively in places like London, and other great centres, with the problem of the unemployed. Taking Ireland as a whole, it is, compared with almost any nation in Europe, blessed with a mild climate and fertile soil. Here you have a race of men proved by the history of the world to be brave and able. You talk of Irish thriftlessness and laziness. Go, as I have done, through the world and see the labours that have been performed, the industry expended, and the ability shown by the Irish race. It is incontrovertible that in every country but their own the Irish have been industrially successful, have risen to the highest positions, and have shown themselves well fitted for the arts of government and industry. Why is it that in their own country alone they are inflicted with these physical and moral plagues which make

Ireland almost a desert? Here is a fertile country inhabited by such a race, and yet the population is flying from it as if it were a plague-stricken land. I have shown but one half of the picture. Ireland is cursed with the costliest government of any country in the world. The cost of the civil government per head of the population is just double what it is in England. The total civil charges for Scotland last year amounted to £2,477,000; for Ireland they were £4,547,000. Ireland's judicial system cost £200,000 more than the Scottish system: and the Irish police cost exactly three times as much as the police of Scotland, although the populations are practically the same and the crime of Ireland is less to-day than the crime of Scotland.

On this question of finance allow me to recall to the memory of the House that ten years ago a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland. That was not an Irish Commission. It had a British majority upon it. It contained some of the greatest financial experts of the country, and it examined as witnesses all the greatest authorities on finance. That Commission reported ten years ago that Ireland, according to her comparative taxable capacity, was taxed close upon three millions a year too much. In seeking redress for that grievance we were supported by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh and most of the Ulster Members, including the late Mr. Lecky, and most of the Irish Unionists. We had also the support of the hon. and learned Member for the City of London, whom I heartily welcome back to the House because, among other reasons, I heartily respect the motives which drove him out of it some years ago. We had his support and that of a certain number of independent English Members of this House. Ireland has waited ten years for redress, but none has come; and, not only that, but since the Report was issued £3,000,000 a year additional taxation has been placed upon the country. During fifty years, while the population has declined, while poverty, lunacy and disease have increased, the taxation of Ireland has doubled, and in the administration of £10,000,000 of taxation annually the Irish people have no voice whatever. It is idle to tell us that they have representatives in this House. Any old Member of the House knows what happens about Supply. One of the blessings of Tory rule to the House of Commons has been that what has always been regarded as the first and essential duty of this House, namely, the discussion of Supply, has almost disappeared. We are supposed to get, under the new rule, three days in the session for the discussion of Irish Supply—three days for the discussion of forty or fifty boards and £10,000,000 of money. The result has been for many years past that nine-tenths of this enormous sum has been passed by the closure without a single word of discussion by Irish Members. For this enormous taxation we have the worst, and—to use Lord Rosebery's word—the most inefficient government in the whole world. Lord Dunraven, in one of his speeches, said—

> "We are governed as no other people in the world are governed. It is difficult to understand what that which is commonly called Castle Government in Ireland really means. It is not democratic, or a despotism, or an oligarchy. No body on earth has any control over its members. They are fed from the Consolidated Fund, many of them, and no one can say that such a form of government is suitable to the needs of the country or the age in which we live."

Lord Lansdowne, in the House of Lords not many months ago, used this remarkable phrase—

> "There is room for considerable improvement in the old-fashioned and complicated organisation of the Irish Government."

Sir West Ridgeway, Under-Secretary in Dublin Castle when the late Prime Minister was Chief Secretary, has told us, in a remarkable declaration, that at the very time when he was engaged in carrying out a coercion regimen in Ireland he was at the same time engaged in preparing a great scheme of local government—not of county councils, but of local government in the sense even of devolution, or national council, or something of that kind; and he has told us that from his experience Dublin Castle government is a chaotic anachronism. The same views have been expressed by Sir Robert Hamilton, Sir Redvers Buller, Lord Dudley, and Lord Carnarvon, not to speak of Liberal statesmen. I confess I wish I had by me at the moment the Radical programme—it has gone out of print, and I think the Irish Party will have to reprint it. I have it at home, and I am very familiar with it, and I directly controvert the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to-night that his scheme for reform in Ireland was such as has been satisfied by the concession of local government. Nothing of the kind; this scheme was a scheme for the abolition of the rule of Dublin Castle, and the putting into the hands of a great representative body all the great Irish questions including, if I am not mistaken, the questions both of the land and of education. The result of all this was inevitable—the neglect of every interest in Ireland and the dissatisfaction and discontent of every class of the community in Ireland. Our fisheries are neglected, our great waterways are neglected, and our system of transit and railway facilities is the most expensive in Europe. Our harbours are neglected. Our system of education is fifty years behind the least progressive country in Europe. Our working-classes are worse housed and less effort is made to improve their lot than in the case of the working-classes of any country in the world, and it follows that every class in Ireland is dissatisfied with the present system of government. The latest proof of this is to be found in the votes of the Orange democracy of West Belfast which returned my hon. friend. Not long ago Lord Rosebery said he would be prepared to give a colonial constitution to Ireland if only Ireland were loyal. I ask the House of Commons what race of men who are not fools or slaves would be loyal to such a system of government as Ireland has? The remark which I have quoted was a thoughtless, heartless remark, showing a strange forgetfulness of history, which has ever shown that loyalty is the result, not the forerunner, of the concession of self-government. Where you give self-government there you have loyalty. Where you withhold self-government there you have dissatisfaction, disloyalty and disaster. Are Irishmen less loyal than the Canadians, to whom Home Rule was given when they were ready for armed resistance? Are they less loyal than the Boers, to whom responsible government is to be given after a sanguinary war? Would the Australian colonies have been loyal for twenty-four years if government were attempted from Downing-street? If you have any doubt of it ask the Colonial Premiers. There is nothing more remarkable than the fact that every self-governing colony in the Empire has declared openly through its Parliament in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. The last is the declaration to be found in the petition to the King, adopted by the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia. They say—

"The sad history of Ireland, since the Act of Union, shows that no British Parliament can understand or effectually deal with the economic and social condition of that country. Enjoying and appreciating as we do the blessings of Home Rule here we would humbly express the hope that a just measure of Home Rule may be granted to the people of Ireland. They ask for it through their representatives. Never has been request more clear, consistent, and continuous by any nation. As subjects of Your Majesty we are interested in the peace and contentment of all parts of the Empire, and we desire to see this long-standing grievance at the very heart of the Empire removed."

That petition was supported by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, and, although the Leader of the Opposition spoke and voted against it, he said he did so, not because he was against the concession of Home Rule for Ireland, but because he thought it wiser for Australia not to interfere with this matter at all. When the Colonial Conference meets, if you want to put a subject before them that is certain to meet with unanimity and enthusiasm, put before them this question of self-government to Ireland, and you will get an unanimous and an enthusiastic declaration in its favour. This problem of Ireland will not brook delay. Ireland is now peaceful. There is no political disorder, and no crime of any sort in the country. One of the most fatal characteristics of English concessions to Ireland in the past has been that they have nearly always been given—I will not say in consequence of—but at any rate following periods of unrest, and of violence, and I respectfully urge that the English politician who would say that because Ireland is peaceful, because there is no political turmoil and no crime, therefore this problem can wait, would be incurring a risk and responsibility from which I think any man of knowledge and experience should shrink. The King's Speech alludes to Ireland. I deeply regret that there is no statement in the Speech with regard to the land question. I freely acknowledge, however, that the Government by their administrative acts have done a great deal on this question since they came into office. They have undoubtedly freed the hands of the Commissioners and put it into their power to go a long way in settling some of the worst features of the Irish land question. I look forward with great hope to the speedy settlement of a greater portion, at any rate, of the evicted tenants. But no one who understands Ireland can doubt that serious amendments in other respects—amendments which can only be carried out by legislation — are necessary. This Act was not passed merely to allow one person to transfer property in land to another person. The object of the Land Act of 1903 was to settle the Irish land question, and to remove from Ireland that perennial source of misery and that squalid struggle between the classes in that country; and that object can never be achieved by this Act unless it is amended, and unless, in certain directions, the element of compulsion is applied. I regret that no announcement is made of an intention to amend this Act. It will, of course, be our duty to press that consideration upon the Government, and experience and pressure of events I believe will bring home to them the conviction that they must soon introduce legislation for this purpose. In regard to the Coercion Act I notice that the Speech from the Throne says that Ireland is to be governed by the ordinary law, and I freely admit that the Government have withdrawn all the proclamations which kept in force the Coercion Act. I gather from the Prime Minister that it is the intention and policy of the Government to introduce a measure to remove that law from the Statute-book. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman could take up any other attitude, because, when the Bill was passing through the House, the Liberal Party fought it tooth and nail, clause by clause, every session, and the whole of the Liberal Party have voted in favour of its immediate repeal. Last session, when the hon. Member for North Kildare moved a motion declaring that the Coercion Act was unconstitutional and should be immediately repealed, the whole of the Liberal Party—all the so-called sections of it—were led into the lobby in support of that Amendment by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who made on that occasion one of the most eloquent and vehement speeches I have ever heard him make, protesting that this Act was a disgrace to the country and should be removed from the Statute-book. I regret that the Government have not mentioned a Bill to repeal this Act in the King's Speech. I urge upon the Prime Minister that he ought to introduce such a Bill this session. Whilst such a measure might be vigorously debated on the Second Reading it would not occupy much time during the Committee stage; and as to the fate that might meet it in the other House that ought not to deter the Government from introducing a measure to which they are so completely pledged. I admit the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham as to the vagueness of the references to Ireland in the King's Speech. The words are vague, and if the honour had been done me of asking me to draft those words I should have drafted them very differently. They may mean little, they may mean a great deal. The fact that they are there puts upon me the duty of reiterating the unchanged position of the Irish Party on the question of national self-government. Our attitude has not changed one hair's breadth for twenty-five years. While we take all that comes our way in amelioration of the lot of the Irish people, the Irish question can never be finally or satisfactorily settled except by the concession to Ireland of a Parliament and an executive responsible to it. I feel bound to make that declaration, and to say we shall give every encouragement to the Government in any effort of theirs to deal with that question. In coming to deal with it they will find the Nationalists reasonable and practical men—men who have spent twenty-five years of their lives in endeavouring to win this right for their country, men who do not want to die until they see some great advance made along the road; and, therefore, men who will not wantonly or perversely alienate the sympathy or support of any man or body of men who believe in the principle of settling the Irish question on the basis of self-government. My colleagues and I have been complained of because we made no bargain with the Prime Minister before the election, and the right hon. Gentleman has vehemently denied any bargain. That is strictly accurate, as there could have been no bargain except on the basis of an immediate concession of a full measure of Home Rule as the first Bill of the Session, and on the basis of an alliance implying the merging of our Parliamentary forces with the forces of the Prime Minister. I hold the view that the independence of the Irish Party is better both for us and the Liberal Party, and hence no bargain was entered into, or thought of, between the right hon. Gentleman and us. Our critics say, "If you had no secret understanding with the Government, why did you assist them in rejecting the last Government?" My mind goes back to a famous meeting in August, 1901, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the late Prime Minister went down to Blenheim and declared open war upon the Irish Party.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I hope they enjoy the result now.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: With their then majority of 150 they were spoken of as the strongest Government of modern times, and those two right hon. Gentlemen declared that this enormous power was to be used to diminish the influence of the Irish Members and to muzzle us on the floor of the House. What has become of their effort to muzzle the Irish Members? Where is their scheme to rob Ireland of thirty seats? Where is their majority? Where is their Party? Where is their leader? They have all disappeared, and the Irish Members are here as numerous as ever. That Government broke its pledge to introduce a satisfactory Labourers Bill, they reimposed coercion upon Ireland, and, having passed the Land Act of 1903, with the unanimity of all Parties, they immediately began, by secret instructions and otherwise, to block its fair and useful operation; and even if they had believed that Ireland could gain nothing from a Liberal Government and that the Prime Minister, after his honourable and consistent record of the past twenty years, was going to prove false to Ireland, the Irish Members would have felt it their duty to do all they could to drive the last Government from office. The present Government has an unparalleled opportunity. One result stands out above all else. Home Rule is no longer a bogey to frighten the English people. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham waxed indignant upon the circulation of some cartoons on Chinese labour, which he thought were unfair and untrue. What about the cartoons that he and his friends issued depicting the Irishman as an inhuman brute, stabbing innocent women and children? In one constituency the hon. Gentleman who won the seat issued an autograph letter, in which he said—

> "If Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is returned to office, Mr. Redmond will bring pressure to bear on him and his Government by the murder of innocent citizens and the mutilation of cattle."

[Cries of "Oh."] The indignation of the right hon. Gentleman when there was a picture circulated of two Chinamen with their hands tied behind them is ludicrous when the very men who express this indignation are guilty of such conduct against political opponents. Home Rule is no longer a bogey to the English electors. We have been taught that the predominant partner must be converted. The predominant partner has now returned a Government which for twenty years has been pledged to the principle of Home Rule, and I am convinced that public opinion in this country is to-day perfectly prepared for some great reconstructive policy with regard to the government of Ireland. The Liberal Government of to-day has an enormous majority and enormous power. Its enemies have disappeared, the difficulties in their path on the Irish question have melted away, many of them have been removed by the action of the Unionist Party, and therefore I beg the Government to recognise the urgency of this question and not delay in their intention to deal with it. I notice with satisfaction that the King's Speech says that final plans are under consideration for the purpose of dealing with this question. I beg that the final consideration of these plans be not postponed, and I beg of the Government in preparing those plans not to be half-hearted or timid. In the last session of the old Parliament I moved an Amendment to the Address in the following terms—

> "We humbly represent to Your Majesty that the present system of Government in Ireland is in opposition to the will of the Irish people and gives them no voice in the management of their own affairs; that the system is consequently inefficient and extravagantly costly; that it does not enjoy the confidence of any section of the population;

that it is productive of universal discontent and unrest, and is incapable of satisfactorily promoting the material and intellectual progress of the people."

Sir, that Amendment was supported by the entire Liberal Party. If I speak of sections of the Party I am sure no hon. Gentleman opposite will think I use the phrase in an invidious or offensive sense. I do so because the public talk of sections; and I say that this declaration was supported by all so-called sections of the Liberal Party, by all the men who sit on those Benches without exception, save those who are new to Parliament on this occasion. Therefore that statement is no longer a statement of mine or a statement of the Irish Party. It is the declaration of the Liberal Party. That is your own declaration, and that declaration proves at one and the same time the grave and urgent character of this problem. I beg of you, when you come to deal with it, to have the courage of your convictions and to deal with it boldly. Sir, in conclusion, one word more and one only. Once again Ireland has lifted her head, that head which so long has been bowed in sorrow and almost in despair. Once again the hope of a better day, of a coming day of justice, of liberty, and at least of comparative prosperity, is pulsing through her veins. God grant for her sake, but equally for yours, that that hope be not disappointed.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) congratulated the Postmaster-General on the attitude which he had taken up on the question of trade unionism, and said he hoped the example set by the right hon. Gentleman would be followed by other great departments, especially the War Office and the Admiralty. There were rumours that it was the intention to revert to the old custom by which the House met at three in the afternoon. He trusted no countenance would be lent to a proposal of that kind. If there was to be a change it should be in the other direction. The business of the nation was too important a matter to be left to the fag end of a day, the best part of which had been spent at business. If the legislation of the country was conducted in the honest light of day instead of in the glare of the gas light, it would be a distinct advantage to the community at large. He regretted the omission in the King's Speech of any reference to temperance reform. They should remember, however, that it was impossible to attempt everything in one session. There was one reform which the Government might undertake. New Members must have been painfully struck with the fact that they could not introduce a friend into the public smoking-room without passing a bar at which intoxicating liquor was sold. A Government strongly imbued with temperance principles might inaugurate a reform here without waiting for legislation, and he ventured to say that this would be a reform which would meet with approval from all parts of the House. With regard to Army reform, at the present time, the ex-Commander-in-chief was stumping the country in support of what was really a very thinly-veiled form of conscription, and the churches and the schools were being used as recruiting agencies for popularising the Army and familiarising the youth of the country with military ideas and drill. There was no lack of genuine patriotism on the part of the working classes, but they had a strong objection to anything that savoured of conscription, whether veiled or open. He had fully expected that the Government would give some indication of a determination to lead the nation away from the war-spirit and declare its intention of co-operating with other nations on the Continent in the establishment of a league of peace for the suppression of war as a means of settling international disputes. He hoped such was the intention of the Government. He hoped he was right in assuming from the King's Speech in regard to this matter that such was the intention of the Government. He sincerely hoped also that we had got away from that spirit of filibustering Imperialism which had cost the nation so dear, not only in money, but in prestige.

There were one or two questions on which he desired fuller information in regard to Chinese labour. He had listened to what the Prime Minister had to say on this point. The anticipations raised in the country by the denunciations of Chinese labour during the election were strong, and would not, he felt certain, be satisfied by the position now taken up with regard to this question by the Government. It was not enough to say that inasmuch as the colony would shortly have Home Rule or responsible government, the question should be held in abeyance until they could decide for themselves whether Chinese labour was to be permitted or not. The point for the moment was that Chinese labour was associated in the public mind with Chinese slavery, and the colony ought to be freed from the difficulty which the mother country had imposed upon it before responsible government was established. The same authority which made Chinese labour possible should withdraw Chinese labour before the advent of responsible government. He desired more specific information on these points. He understood from the Prime Minister that Chinamen desiring to be repatriated would be able to have their passage paid home, if no other means were available. He asked whether, in the event of the Imperial Government having to pay the cost of the voyage home of Chinamen, the sum so expended was to be recoverable from the mine-owners, and, if so, what security was there that the mine-owners would meet this liability any better than they had met former liabilities. He was not quite sure that he understood the Prime Minister when he spoke about punishments. Was it understood now that no punishment could be inflicted on these Chinamen until they had been brought before a court of justice and tried for the offence with which they were charged? If that were so it would mark a very great improvement indeed in the conditions under which these people worked, but if lashing was still to be permitted within the compounds or within the mines, then the old conditions would practically remain under the new Government. In the Address there was a reference to merchant shipping and the promise of an amending Bill. He trusted that the measure to be introduced would totally prohibit the employment on British ships of foreign seamen, unable to speak the English language. The stipendiary of Cardiff, in a case of inquiry the other day into the loss of a ship, made the alarming and astounding statement that this was the third investigation of the kind he had had within a month, and that in each of the three cases the vessels had been manned by seamen unable to speak the English language. That pointed to a very serious state of affairs. There was no scarcity of British seamen, and the only reason for giving the foreigner a preference was that he could be had at a lower rate of wages than British Jack Tars would accept. The bill of fare in the King's Speech was in the promise at least fairly satisfactory. What it would be in the performance remained to be seen, and the Labour Members would not prejudge the Government in regard to their Labour legislation. They would reserve their judgment until the measures had been produced, but they hoped that in dealing with the topics enumerated in the King's Speech the Government would deal with them in a whole-hearted fashion, so as to secure a final settlement of each. If they were only dealt with in a half-hearted manner there would be further demands made on the time of the House. Take, for instance, the Taff Vale question. He understood that there was substantial agreement in regard to the main lines of the measure, with the exception of what was known as Clause 3 of last year's Bill. The Labour Party in the country—both the trade union side and the political side—had stated with no uncertain voice what they desired in this matter. They claimed absolute immunity for trade union funds from any claims for damages arising out of trade disputes. It was said that this was an illogical position to assume. It was said that where the responsible officers of a trade union were responsible for an offence the funds of the union should be held liable for the loss sustained. Their reply was, "If an officer offends against the law, punish the officer, but do not punish the whole of the members for his indiscretion or want of judgment." Those of them who had had some experience of labour movements were aware that if the slightest opening were left whereby an entrance might be made on trade union funds, the law would find that entrance, and they therefore asked that the Trade Union Bill should be a practical Bill, and that in particular the funds of the unions should be placed beyond the touch of employers seeking damages.

In regard to the Education Bill he desired to mention briefly two aspects of the question which were bound to receive a good deal of attention before the measure became law. They had heard this afternoon in the excellent speech of the seconder of the Address an expression of the hope that some method might be found for composing the religious differences which now existed, and which constituted the chief bar to the building up of a proper educational system. He had endeavoured to find out in what way these differences could be composed without leaving heartburning or a sense of hardship behind, and so far as his investigations had gone there appeared to him to be but one method by which the miserable irreligious controversy over religious instruction could be disposed of once for all and that was by taking religious instruction out of the hands of the teachers altogether. A great deal was heard about religious tests, but to make it compulsory on a teacher to give religious instruction, no matter how undenominational it might be, was to impose a religious test which many of our best teachers could not conscientiously adopt. Religion should not be taught by public school teachers. Clergymen of all denominations were never tired of bewailing the irreligious spirit of the age; but how much of this spirit might not be attributed to the fact that children were taught religion in a perfunctory manner by overworked school teachers? In the best interests of religion, therefore, it was desirable that those who gave religious instruction should be the parents and the spiritual guides of the people and not those who were engaged, or ought to be engaged, in purely and exclusively secular teaching. But perhaps a more important question was the physical condition of the children to receive such instruction. It was useless to go on trying to instil education into the brains of half-starved children. There was the question of seeing that the body of the child was in a condition to receive instruction from its teacher. He would not go into this subject at length. In the last House of Commons his friend and colleague the Member for the Barnard Castle Division introduced a Bill on the subject. That Bill would be again introduced and it would give the House a lead along the road which he hoped they would be willing to take towards conferring on public authorities full and complete powers to make provision for those school children whose conditions were such at present as totally to unfit them for assimilating the instruction which the teachers were engaged in giving. He was delighted that the King's Speech gave promise of an amended Unemployed Bill. The Act of last session had proved, as it was predicted it would prove, a failure in so far as dealing with the unemployed difficulty was concerned, but it had laid the foundation for a more comprehensive and effective measure. They expected the measure — especially remembering who was President of the Local Government Board—would be comprehensive and wide in its scope, and that it would not tie local authorities down to one particular method of dealing with unemployment. The local authorities in this country should be free to try experiments in order to find out what was the best way to deal with a national problem. It was also to be hoped that the financial limitations which now hindered the new authorities would be removed in the new Bill. Where the penny rate proved insufficient some form of national grant should supplement the local rates, so as to spread the cost over the community and not leave it as a local burden on the poorer localities. He hoped that the State, apart from what the local authorities would do, would also provide permanent employment for the unemployed by means of afforestation and great public undertakings.

Neither would it suffice for the Government to stand by a mere negative on the policy of fiscal reform. The Government must have an attractive policy of reform to counteract the influence of those who put tariff reform forward as a means of helping the working classes. When the Government were dealing with the question of plural voting he hoped that they would also reform the absurd and antiquated registration laws and include the payment of official election expenses. It might be that before this session closed the House would find itself in conflict with another place, involving an appeal to the country. The nation was not at present equipped for that struggle as it ought to be, and as it would be after a thorough reform of the registration laws. Not only was one-third of the male population outside the franchise, but the whole of the women of the country. He hoped the Liberal Government would remove the scandal and disgrace of treating women, because they were women, no better than if they were criminals, paupers, or peers. He trusted, therefore, that women suffrage would form one of the items to be dealt with when the franchise was being tackled.

There were several references in the King's Speech to South Africa, and he was delighted to learn that responsible government was to be given to the Transvaal and also to the Orange River Colony. The trust and confidence to be reposed in the people of these lands would, he was certain, be productive of the very best results. But there was one fact connected with South Africa at present on which he thought they were entitled to ask for some information. He hoped that the Government would give information as to the sinister rumours which were in circulation about native unrest in Natal. Some sinister statements were being made in the public Press. They learned already that the Press censor was at work in South Africa. Those who took an intelligent interest in the war with the Boer Republic would remember how at that time the reports we got from South Africa were those which suited the interests of the mineowners only, how the truth was suppressed, how every lie that could inflame and prejudice the passions of the people here against the Boers of the Transvaal was put freely into circulation, and the country knew the price it had to pay for allowing that line of action. It looked as if at the present time the country was being prepared for another war in South Africa. It was stated that the natives were showing unrest and refusing to pay their taxes, and that they had been guilty of murder. It was possible that these romours were the outcome of a policy of irritation to the natives with the purpose of forcing them into a war as the Boers were forced into war six or seven years ago. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would keep a close eye on these developments in Natal and South Africa, so as to prevent a second war being waged in that far off country.

With respect to Ireland it seemed a strange anomaly that Ireland was the only part of the world where the Irish people were not allowed to exercise their undoubted faculties for government. Anyone who visited Ireland and saw the poverty and depression of spirit must realise what a curse British rule had been to the Irish people. It must be a source of gladness to those who had fought so long that at length there was a hope of securing justice to the people of Ireland, and that they would be able to share in the administration of the affairs of their own country. He and his friends on those benches would take no part in the ordinary strife and warfare of Party politics. They were here to force to the front the question of the condition of the people of England and to safeguard the rights of the poor. Why was it that wealth accumulated while men decayed? One cause was that the law makers of Great Britain had hitherto been drawn almost exclusively from the wealth owners of Great Britain. The working classes had been represented only at second hand by men whose interests were diametrically opposed to theirs. [LIBERAL cries of "No, no!"] He contended that the workers could not trust their interests to men whose pocket interest — always a powerful factor in influencing conduct—led them to desire that the workers should remain in their poverty — [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"]—He was glad to hear that protest —and in the condition in which they now were. Property was sacred in England, but life was a thing of no account. Why was it that amongst the children of the poor in our great cities 66 per 1,000 died before they reached one year of age, while only 18 per 1,000 of the children of the class who sat in Parliament died before attaining one year? It was because the life of the poor was of less account than the property from which their income was derived. When they saw that three sides of the House were under the control of, and tenanted by, men whose pocket interests were diametrically opposed to those of the working classes — [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"]—it was essential that there should be one section of the House, at least, representing the workers and the poor. He and his friends asked for this Government a fair trial. They believed that their legislation would be more advanced than that of any Government which had gone before, and the explanation of that would be found in the fact that at length the workers of the country were bestirring themselves, and insisting on legislation being passed for their benefit. They would not attempt to pre-judge the Government, but to give fair consideration to every proposal which they brought forward, and to keep before them at all times and under all circumstances the welfare, not of this Party or of that, but of the poor, who had hitherto been without friends, because they had not taken the trouble to protect themselves.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said he agreed with the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil that the re-patriation of Chinamen from South Africa ought to be carried out at the cost of the mine-owners. He was not quite sure that the hon. Gentleman rightly interpreted the Prime Minister when he attributed to the Government the policy of leaving the question entirely in the hands of the people of the Transvaal. There were many Members of the House who believed that forced labour ought not to be allowed under any circumstances or conditions in any part of the dominions of the King. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, whose statements were notoriously inaccurate, and whose figures were sometimes mere illustrations, complained that afternoon of the exaggerated accounts of the condition in which the Chinaman worked in South Africa. If Rip Van Winkle were an Englishman and had waked out of his long sleep last month, he possibly would have been surprised at the supreme importance attached to the question of Chinese labour, and he would not have been astonished to find that the English people were indignant at the revival of slavery and the slave trade under the British flag. He would have known that the people of this country, who were not idiots, did not believe in the distinction between slavery and forced labour. What excited such intense indignation about Chinese labour in this country was the fact that it was the sign and symbol of that gigantic swindle, that colossal fraud, the policy of the late Government in South Africa. Five and a half years ago the people of this country were humbugged and deceived. In Lord Milner's happy phrase they were drenched with lies; but their eyes were open now to the fact that the policy of the late Government was engineered in South Africa by bloodthirsty money grubbers—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"]—mostly of foreign extraction, without honour, without conscience, without country, without God. The people of this country did not forget, and they never could forget, the splendid heroism of their soldiers, some of whom earned for themselves everlasting renown and none of whom were responsible for the cause for which they fought. They saw now, but they did not see then, that the war was a sweaters' war, a war for cheap labour, a war against the working classes, against liberty, against independence and against everything which Englishmen most revered. This was not always the unanimous opinion of the Liberal Party. In the face of the great, united, cohesive organism which he saw before him, he did not hesitate to admit that the Liberals had had their differences, their dissensions, their gaping wounds. Who had healed them? In the hour of their recovery let them not forget the services of their physician. They ought to erect a statue, not of gold, for it was beyond their means, but of brass to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. It was he who had re-united them. It was he who had brought Imperialists into line with mere patriots. He was sure that it would rejoice the heart of the right hon. Gentleman to know that it was he who had removed the jealousies between employers and employed and sent them to the poll together in defence of their common interest, their bread and butter. It was he who had submitted to the working classes for the first time in all its length and breadth the issue between protection and free trade. He had dressed up the carcass of protection, the rotten, stinking carcass, in the tinsel finery of tariff reform, and from one end of the country to the other, from John O' Groat's to Lands End, there came back the shout: "Take it away. Give it decent, or indecent, burial, but let us never see or hear of the foul thing again." The result of the general election reminded him of the epigram written of the lady who had the misfortune to be the wife of George IV., and who imitated his vices so far as the infirmities of her sex would permit. It began—

"Most gracious Joe."

He begged pardon.

"Most gracious Queen, we thee implore,
To go away and sin no more;
Or, if that burden be too great,
To go away, at any rate."

The right hon Gentleman, fortunately for himself and for them, had been enabled to entrench himself within the impregnable fortress of our English Tammany. He admired the authority which the right hon. Gentleman exercised, and the confidence which he enjoyed among the people who knew him best. It was said of a great Roman that in the opinion of all men, he would have been capable of Empire if he had never been an Emperor. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham might have been thought a great Imperialist statesman if he had not taken rather late in life to Imperialism. He wished that Mr. Balfour were present. If his absence were more than temporary, he would be the greatest intellectual loss the House could suffer — except Lord Hugh Cecil. He would rather pay the right hon. Gentleman compliments to his face than behind his back. The right hon. Gentleman was the nearest approach in these degenerate days to the Greek sophist. The Greak sophists were men of extreme mental subtlety, and of intense personal respectability. They were men of wealth and station; they went everywhere, and knew everybody. They proved all things; they held fast to that which was bad. They undertook to prove that there was no difference between right and wrong, and anything was just which anybody who could afford to pay them wanted to do. They lived lives of uninterrupted felicity until a tiresome person called Socrates appeared and began to ask them questions. Socrates wanted to know what they meant by justice, and why, if there was no difference between right and wrong, they had two names for the same thing. They voted Socrates a public nuisance, and they put him to death. But he left a numerous intellectual progeny, and some of them had settled in Manchester. These asked Mr. Balfour what he meant by free trade, and why, if it was the same thing as protection, he did not call it by the same name. If he had answered with truth that free trade was a tariff for public revenue, and that protection was a tariff for private interest, he would have lost his bearings. He made no intelligible answer, and he lost his seat. What was the right hon. Gentleman's policy of retaliation? "If other countries tax our goods, why should we not tax theirs?" That sounded clever, did it not? The wonder was that nobody had ever thought of it before. Could it possibly be that the real meaning of it was somewhat different? "Because foreign Governments tax their subjects let us make our Government tax theirs." That sounded silly, did it not? It sounded silly because it was silly; and because it was silly it would not be done. They free traders had been on velvet. It did not require much ability or learning to show that a nation which depended on foreign food, which imported immense quantities of raw material, and manufactured for mankind, depended for its prosperity—even for its very existence—upon free access to the world's supply. He himself could defend a platitude against a paradox. Chief Justice Jervis said that the world was divided into fools and damned fools, and he thanked God that he was born a fool. He had never felt so thankful for that privilege as when he read Mr. Balfour's academic prolusion, entitled "Some Unsettled Convictions on Political Economy." He thought to himself, "How marvellously acute, and, after all, perhaps it is true." He dared say protection would not do much harm to an uninhabited island in an undiscoverable sea; but what consolation would that be to the 5,000,000 of Lancashire folk who depended upon the cotton trade, when the margin of their profit had been destroyed? They had little more to do than to expound the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue. "Thou shalt not murder." A tax upon corn was murder. "Thou shalt not steal." A corner in wheat was stealing. "Give us this day our daily bread." That was what John Bright meant when he said that he and Richard Cobden had converted a great minister, and had put the Lord's Prayer into an Act of Parliament. Once there, not all the efforts of all the strong men of Birmingham, the seven against sense, taking into their counsels all the wise men of Gotham, the Members of the Tariff Reform League, would ever avail to take it out.

Mr. Paul.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Burdett-Coutts*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 20th February, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Annual accounts for the year ending 5th January, 1905, of Exchequer bills and other Government securities purchased.

Applications made by the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England for advances to Government authorised by Parliament from 5th January, 1905, to 5th January, 1906.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Orders made by the councils of the following county, borough, and urban district, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing certain shops in the—

City and county of Kingston-upon-Hull.

Borough of Eccles.

County of Chester.

Urban district of Swinton and Pendlebury.

DUCHY OF LANCASTER.

Account of the receipts and disbursements of the Duchy of Lancaster in the year ended 21th December, 1905; also a separate account of the capital of the said Duchy to the same date.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at half-past Four o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 20th February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Several other Members took and subscribed the oath.

NEW WRITS.

New Writ for the County of Kilkenny (North Kilkenny Division), in the room of Joseph Devlin, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Kilkenny (North Kilkenny Division) and also for the Borough of Belfast (West Belfast Division), has elected to sit for the Borough of Belfast (West Belfast Division).—(*Captain Donelan.*)

New Writ for the County of Leitrim (North Leitrim Division), in the room of Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Leitrim (North Leitrim Division) and also for the County of Sligo (North Sligo Division), has elected to sit for the County of Sligo (North Sligo Division).—(*Captain Donelan.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table a Report from the Counsel to Mr. Speaker, That, in accordance with Standing Order 79 he had conferred with the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords, for the purpose of determining in which House of Parliament the respective Private Bills should be first considered, and they had determined that the Bills contained in the following List should originate in the House of Lords, viz.:—

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway.

Barrie Railway.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bournemouth Corporation.

Bridgewater Canals.

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay.

Clacton Urban District Council.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply.

Crediton Lighting and Power.

Croydon Corporation Water.

Crystal Palace Company.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.

Dover Corporation.

Dover Harbour Board.

Dover Harbour (Works, &c.).

Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.

Folkestone, Sandgate and Hythe Tramways (No. 1).

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways (No. 2).

Fulwood Urban District Water.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.

Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.

Haslingden Corporation.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.

Holyhead Water.

H. R. Baines and Company.

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).

Hull Joint Dock.

Kent Collieries Electricity Supply.

Kent Electric Power.

Kidderminster Gas.

Knot End Railway (Extension of Time).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.

Llandrindod Wells Gas.

London and North Western Railway.

London Squares and Enclosures.

Manchester Churches.

Manchester and Milford Railway.

Maryport Harbour.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.

Mersey Railway.

Mid-Derbyshire Railway.

Milford Docks.

Mirfield Gas.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).

Newport Corporation.

Newport Harbour Commissioners.

Newtownards Urban District Council.

North Sussex Gas and Water.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.

Penllwyn Railway and Road.

Portsmouth Water.

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).

Rugby Subordinate School.

Sheffield Assay Office.

Sheffield District Railway.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time).

Thames Harbour.

Trent Navigation Company.

Truro Gas.

Vauclain's Patent.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

West Cumberland Electric Tramways.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.

West Yorkshire Tramways.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas.

PETITIONS.

DIONYSIUS, THADDEUS.

Petition from Thaddeus Dionysius, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

FUTTEH DIN.

Petition from Futteh Din, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING).

Petition from Reading, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

NUBIA.

Petition from Nubia, son of Hara, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

PILLAI, JOHN MANOOK.

Petition from John Manook Pillai, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

SAHAI, GAJADHAR.

Petition from Gajadhar Sahai, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY CLOTHING FACTORY.

Annual Accounts presented, of the Royal Army Clothing Factory for the year 1904–5, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 35.]

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

Abstract Accounts presented, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 36].

DUCHY OF LANCASTER.

Accounts presented, for the year ended 21st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 37.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the City and County of Kingston-upon-Hull and the Town Council of the Borough of Eccles fixing the time of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops; by the Council of the County of Chester, fixing the time of Closing for Barbers' Shops in the Urban Districts of Hazel Grove and Bramhall, and Lower Bebington; and by the Council of the Urban District of Swinton and Pendlebury fixing the time of Closing for Hairdressers' Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SEAMEN'S SAVINGS BANKS (MONEY ORDERS AND TRANSMISSION OF WAGES).

Accounts presented, of all Deposits received and repaid during the year ended 20th November, 1904, and Statement as to Money Orders issued and paid from 1855 to 31st March, 1905, and of Receipts and Payments in connection with the Transmission of Seamen's Wages from 1878 to 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 38.]

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Bank of England, Accounts of Exchequer Bills and other Government Securities purchased, and Amount of Balances of Sums issued for the Payment of Dividends, etc., for the year ending 5th January, 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 39.]

2. Bank of England, Copy of all applications made by the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England for advances to Government authorised by Parliament, from 5th January, 1905, to

5th January, 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 40.]

TRADE AND NAVIGATION.

Accounts ordered, "relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom for each month during the year 1906."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

BREWERS' LICENCES.

Return ordered, "of Accounts of the number of persons in each of the several Collections of the United Kingdom licensed as Brewers for sale, *i.e.* Common Brewers, Victuallers, Retailers of beer to be drunk on the premises, Retailers of beer not to be drunk on the premises, and Brewers of beer not for sale, particularising each class in each Collection; and of the number of Licences issued to Victuallers and Retailers of beer to be drunk on the premises and not to be drunk on the premises; and stating also the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, &c., sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, &c., hops and hop substitutes, used by Brewers of beer for sale, and of malt and sugar used by brewers not for sale, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905."

"Of the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, distinguishing Brewers for sale from other Brewers."

"Of the number of Brewers for sale (i.) who use malt and hops, or hop substitutes only, and (ii.) who use malt with substitutes for same and hops or hop substitutes paying for Licences, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, separating them into classes, according to the number of barrels of beer charged with duty calculated at 1·055 degrees gravity, viz.: under 1,000 barrels; 1,000 and under 10,000; 10,000 and under 20,000; 20,000 and under 30,000; 30,000 and under 50,000; 50,000 and under 100,000; 100,000 and under 150,000; 150,000 and under 200,000; 200,000 and under 250,000; 250,000 and under 300,000; 300,000 and under 350,000; 350,000 and under 400,000; 400,000 and under 450,000; 450,000 and under 500,000; 500,000 and under 600,000; 600,000 and under 700,000; 700,000 and under 800,000; 800,000 and under 900,000; 900,000 and under 1,000,000; 1,000,000 and under 1,500,000; 1,500,000 and under 2,000,000; 2,000,000 barrels and over; showing separately, in each class, the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, &c., sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, &c., hops and hop substitutes used; and stating also the number of bulk barrels of beer produced, and the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged in each class."

"And, of the number of barrels of beer exported from the United Kingdom, and the declared value thereof, and where exported to, from the 1st day of October, 1904, to the 30th day of September, 1905, distinguishing England, Scotland, and Ireland (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 26, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

NATIONAL GALLERY (REPORT).

Copy ordered, "of Report of the Trustees of the National Gallery for the year 1905, with Appendices." — (*Mr. McKenna*).

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1904–5.

Copy ordered, "of Accounts of the Civil Contingencies Fund, 1904–5, showing (1) the receipts and payments in connection with the Fund in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1905; (2) the distribution of the capital of the Fund at the commencement and close of the year; together with Copy of the Correspondence with the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

Copy ordered, "of Account of receipts and payments of the Accountant General of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland in respect of the funds of suitors in the said Court, including therein funds to the credit of lunacy accounts, in the year to the 30th day of September, 1905, together with a statement of liabilities and assets and particulars of securities in Court on the 30th day of September, 1905."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Tuberculosis—Compensation for Compulsory Slaughter.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill providing compensation to the owners of animals purchased at full market value in open market but subsequently condemned for alleged tuberculosis; whether he will in the meantime arrange that a uniform system of inspection of native meat shall be arranged, and that imported, especially boneless, meat shall be inspected in a similar fashion.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I could not promise to introduce a Bill on the subject referred to in the first part of the Question pending the Report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis. Legislation would be necessary to secure a uniform system of meat inspection, but a Report to the Local Government Board by Dr. Buchanan, one of their medical inspectors, has lately been issued on administration in London with regard to pigs affected by tuberculosis, which will no doubt receive the consideration of local authorities, and will, I hope, lead to some improvement in the present system.

Examination of Imported Boneless Meat.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state if any inspection is made of the boneless meat imported into Great Britain; whether he will cause inquiries to be made; and whether he has any official information showing that this imported boneless meat is being extensively used to make sausages advertised and sold as native pork sausages.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that inspection of imported boneless meat is frequently made at the Central Meat Market in London, and also to some extent by officers of Metropolitan borough councils. I cannot say how far such inspection is made elsewhere in England and Wales, with which I am alone concerned, but I will consider how far it may be practicable to obtain information on the subject. I am informed that in London packages of American "pork cuttings," which are included in the boneless meat above referred to, are sold at the Central Meat Market to sausage makers, but I do not know whether sausages manufactured from these pork cuttings are advertised or sold as native pork sausages.

Report of Bovine Tuberculosis Commission.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state when the Report of the Royal Commission on Bovine Tuberculosis, especially respecting the experiments being carried on at Stanstead Farm, will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the Royal Commission have a Report in preparation, together with an Appendix containing the details of a large amount of experimental work. I cannot say precisely when it will be issued, but I am informed that it is being pressed forward as speedily as practicable.

Land Purchase in Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland having regard to the common object of all land purchase legislation to deal with the fee-simple, and to the duress under which tenants are now being forced to sign agreements to purchase something less than the fee-simple, leaving in the vendors' hands rights likely to become onerous and sources of further trouble, whether he will protect purchasing tenants against such duress by requiring, in all such cases, proof of their free consent.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) No evidence has reached me to show that such duress as is mentioned in the Question exists to any material extent. The Commissioners have full powers to refuse to make an advance in the case of any agreement which may have been obtained by duress, and they exercise their powers accordingly.

Sale of Colonel Smythe's Estate at Collinstown, West Meath.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Colonel Smythe, of Collinstown, West Meath, has offered to sell his estate to his tenants, and that the attempted sale has failed owing to his refusing to reinstate two evicted tenants, both of whose farms are still untenanted; and whether the Estates Commissioners have approached or will approach this owner in accordance with Section 4 of the Regulations now in force.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have had this case under consideration, and are making inquiries into it.

Irish Landlords and Collection of Rack Rents.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what action the Government propose to take to restrain landlords who, having offered to sell their estates at exhorbitant prices, are now suing the tenants who rejected those terms for rack rents and arrears of rack rents.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Government have no power to take any action interfering with the legal rights possessed by landlords. In any case of a difference as to price in which the Estates Commissioners think that their action as conciliators can aid the parties in arriving at an amicable arrangement they are at liberty to offer their good offices.

Supposed Application of Christopher Clinton for Cottage at Delvin.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the real reason why the Local Government Board have disallowed the application of Christopher Clinton for a cottage and plot in the scheme now promoted by the Delvin District Council under the Labourers' Acts, the reason alleged that the applicant is unmarried having been disregarded in other cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) This Question is based on a misapprehension. The Local Government Board have not disallowed the application referred to, for the reason that the case has not come before them. No representation on behalf of Clinton has been submitted to the Board.

Teaching of Irish in Schools—Withdrawal of Grant.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that the County Dublin County Council, and a number of elected public bodies in Ireland, have passed resolutions protesting against the withdrawal of the £12,000 annual grant for the teaching of Irish, and also asking for the immediate reconstitution of the National Board of Education upon a representative and elective basis; and whether he can state what the Irish Government proposes to do in regard to those matters.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Resolutions to the effect mentioned have been received and will be duly considered. The Question as to the provision to be made for the teaching of Irish after 30th June, 1906, is engaging my careful attention, and communications on the subject are passing between the National Board, the Treasury, and myself. I am not in a position to make any statement as to any future reconstruction of the National Board.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Wages of Post Office Employees.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): In accordance with private notice, I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he proposes to institute a further enquiry into the question of the wages and conditions of the postal servants; and if so, can he state what will be the nature of the enquiry?

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): After careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case, I have come to the conclusion that a further enquiry is necessary into the position of the principal classes of postal servants. The Government have therefore decided to appoint a Select Committee of the House of Commons to enquire into the question of the adequacy, or otherwise, of their renumeration, having regard to the conditions and prospects of their employment with a view to the settlement of the question.

MR. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) asked whether the postmasters and sub-postmasters would be included in the scope of the enquiry.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON asked for notice of a question with regard to the actual scope of the enquiry. He added that he did not think the enquiry could be extended to every class in the service, but the matter would have consideration.

BALLOT FOR BILLS AND MOTIONS.

Ordered, That no Bills, other than Government Bills, be introduced in anticipation of the ballot, and that all Members who desire to ballot, whether for Bills, or Motions for Tuesday, 27th Feburary, and Wednesday, 28th February, and Tuesday, 6th March, and Wednesday, 7th March, do hand in their names at the Table during the sitting of the House on Monday, 19th February, or Tuesday, 20th February, and that a copy of such Notices be handed in, at the latest, during the sitting of the House on Wednesday, 21st February.

That the ballot for the precedence of the said Bills and Motions be taken on Wednesday, 21st February, at a convenient time and place, to be appointed by Mr. Speaker, and that the presentation of Bills on Thursday, 22nd February be taken immediately after Questions.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I beg to give notice that on an early day I shall move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Equalization of Rates (London) Act 1894.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.)

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed:—Debate resumed.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said that the position of a member of the Unionist Party in addressing the present House of Commons was the most inspiring one that the history of the House of Commons had ever presented to any one who had a natural taste for facing fearful odds for the ashes of his fathers and the temples of his gods, or for any other cause. Such, for instance, as the fiscal question; but in view of the announcement of the Prime Minister that he would shortly give a day for that subject, he was not going to deal with it now. He hoped, however, that the hon. Gentlemen would not think he wanted to run away from it.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Where did you go last year?

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS said he followed his leader—unwillingly. And before long hon. Members opposite would find they sometimes had to follow their leader unwillingly. There was nothing in his record to justify the suggestion that he was likely to run away from that or any other question in which he was engaged. He would be very ungrateful if he ran away from the fiscal question, because he gave it a prominent place in a recent experience with the result that he was able to address the House that day. But before he spoke of the unprecedented size, and character, of the majority they had to face, might he be permitted, as one who for twenty years in that House had watched the formation of Ministries—from a distance he had no particular desire to lessen, and therefore could give a disinterested judgment—to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister on the principles that had guided him in the selection of his Ministers? Broadly based in the origins of its appointments; selected without reference to private friendships, and even in unnatural disregard, if they presented themselves to him, of the fond ties of family affection; collecting together all the best intellects and talents the Party could provide; permeated, perhaps dominated, by fresh blood; the Ministry presented in its personal aspects an undoubted claim to their respect. Of course, there was a background to the picture. It remained to be seen how long the Gentlemen, hon. and even right hon., who sat on that Front Bench as representatives of principles which were fundamentally incompatible, and of interests which could never be welded together, would be able to resist the pressure of the heterogeneous groups from which they were derived. For the sincerity, or impatience, as the case might be, of these varied groups would not easily be satisfied with that curious change that always took place in the champions of extreme, sometimes violently extreme, views as soon as they donned the comforting garb of office. The sobering, not to say sterilising, influence which attached to a seat on the Front Bench would be sadly discouraging to the ardent patriots behind and below it, and opposite to it. Each group of those Members owned some special cause or aim, on which it thought the salvation of the country depended. Each had been sent here on the strength of some isolated promise which could probably never be fulfilled, but which the group thought ought to be fulfilled at once, and each would want to be at the head of the great march of progress and reform which this wonderful Government had announced, and which would lead they themselves knew not whither. Might he be permitted to enumerate a few of the elements of this great majority? There were the Irish Members, who did not count for his purpose, because they, apparently, were satisfied with the treatment their favourite had received at the hands of Ministers. That ill-used partner whom they flirted with so violently in the ante-chamber, they seemed to have left in a dubious position the moment they found themselves in the big ball-room, surrounded by a respectable domestic circle. The Welsh Members would want to know why the President of the Board of Trade did not disestablish the Church in Wales before the Chief Secretary for Ireland paid so much attention to "a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people." And the English Liberal Members who—in spite of the extraordinary inference drawn by the hon. Member for Waterford last night that this election had given a majority in favour of Home Rule—won their elections on condition that they would oppose Home Rule, would want to know just what this phrase in the King's Speech meant. If it meant something that would satisfy the Home Rulers it surely did not mean anything that will satisfy some English Liberal constituencies. And the group led by the hon. Member for Hanley, who had got something, would want to know why they did not get more. And the group led by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, who had got nothing, would want to know why they had not got something, and why the President of the Local Government Board did not municipalise all our industries. The right hon. Gentleman and he had had many bouts across the floor of this House. But no one in this House or outside of it could be more sincere in his congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman on attaining a distinction to which his abilities, his energy, his perseverance, and his eloquence richly entitle him. It would be observed that he did not include his policy. Upon that territory the right hon. Gentleman and he would no doubt soon be able to resume their former embittered relations. To proceed, this group would want to know why the land and the railways were not nationalised, why the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India did not agree to the principle of grants being made to the unemployed from the national funds, and why the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not establish old-age pensions from the same source. Further, the Party formerly led by the right hon. Gentleman the ex-Member for Northampton, whose absence from the House all humourists would deplore, and now led by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, who, with all his distinguished abilities, did not supply that special want—the Party that used to be called the advanced Radical section, which now represented a somewhat indistinct fossil of a past Parliamentary age, would want to know why it was shouldered out of place and its living taken away from it by these new groups, and why the particular issues which it used to put forward were not preferred to new inventions it never thought of. In particular, that Party would want to see that the Boers, whose cause it espoused when they were fighting with Englishmen, were more successful when the question of the constitutional organisation of the Empire came up for consideration. They would want to see that the pro-Boer cause was secured before any theoretic advantages of the great Radical principle of one vote one value were considered; and that the Boers were given a permanent electoral predominance in the Transvaal before responsible self-government was finally passed for that Colony. The Liberal Imperialists would watch the Under-Secretary for the Colonies—who sat like a rare and showy exotic on a front Bench so crowded with more natural flowers—to see that he did not, in his way, or in any other, give the Little Englanders an unfair advantage. The Little Englanders would watch the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to make sure that he took the narrowest view of our alliance with Japan, and did not enter into any other equally courageous and beneficent treaty. The Labour Members at large would look askance at the Radical capitalists to see how far they carried out their promises to organised labour which had gained many of them their big majorities; and Radical capitalists would ask why their large subscriptions to the Party fund should be utilised for inroads on the stability of capital. But all these varied groups and parties and sections, each indignant at its own claim being postponed to the rest, would, it was said, unite on the one common ground held by the Nonconformist conscience. Each and all of them had contributed at the recent election to further inflate a balloon which for four years had had carefully pumped into it the poisonous gas of sectarian animosity; and they would all with one accord consent to give priority to the President of the Board of Education when he brought forward his Bill to banish definite religious instruction from the childhood of a Christian country. ["Oh!" and "Will he?"] He would answer that question as far as was possible. By definite religious instruction he meant of course denominational religious instruction, which many of them believed to be the only method of making religious instruction effective in the grown-up life of the individual. The intrinsic or immediate value of denominational or doctrinal instruction to a child might not be very great; but as giving him a faith in which he would believe, a religious community to which he would belong in after-life, a definite and authoritative form of religion in which he could trust and from which he could derive the benefits that religion supplied, denominational religious instruction was the only safeguard. If they were to continue this, not as an "extra," out of school hours, which would make children hate it, but as an essential element in that phase of the child's early life which impressed him most—his education—in what respect were they going to alter the existing Act? He understood it was not proposed to continue it. Nor, as far as he could gather, was it proposed to make elementary education purely secular. Only one other way remained open: to invent a new form of religion. Call it what they would; whether it differed from the present forms or included them all—which was an impossible assumption—it would still be a new form of religion. There would be plenty of opportunities for discussing the question, and he would not stop to do so now. He only wanted to outline broadly the position of the great Liberal Party, which, dissatisfied apparently with the existing Christian faiths, was to become like those mushroom communities of the Western world—the Mormons, or Harrisians, or Shakers—and in the year 1906 was to set out in quest of a new religion to teach the childhood of England. Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, Church people—of course all so-called Nonconformists, for they gladly accepted the idea—were all to become Birrellians. ["Oh"!] And like Joseph Smith, who discovered the Mormon Bible under a stone, the President of the Board of Education was to find a new religion under his Treasury box, and call it "The simple truths of Christianity." Did ever Pope of Rome have ambitions quite so large? But why not? They had Nicholas Breakspear at St. Peter's, and now they had St. Augustine at St. Stephen's,—to be supported, he presumed, in his inventive efforts, by all the followers of the Government who owed spiritual allegiance to Pius X. In the various elements of this great majority there was one that interested him more than all the rest, not only for the cause it represented, but by reason of the new attitude it had assumed. He meant that of the Labour Members. They had thrown off the bonds by which they had hitherto been enslaved to one political Party; they had formed themselves into a separate Party, with a separate programme, and separate whips, thereby enormously gaining in the respect of their own supporters, of the country at large, of the Party to which he had the honour to belong, and of every section of opinion except—if the real truth were known—of the Party opposite. He would be the last to question — no one who had any regard for the true principles of representative Government would question—the right of labour to be directly represented in Parliament. It gained that right not only by virtue of being one of the great component parts of this nation, but by the stronger title of being a fundamental part of every civilised society, and one of the two bases on which the structure of every industrial country was organised; and it had a perfect right not only to be represented in the councils of the nation, but to be represented in what way it liked, and by whom it chose. But hitherto the representatives of labour had presented themselves to Parliament as mere agents of the Radical Central Office. He congratulated them on their emancipation from that equivocal, if not contemptible, position which, justly or unjustly, they had, with rare exceptions, hitherto occupied in the political world. The House of Commons would watch with interest the *bonâ fides* of their new attitude; and just in proportion as their proceedings were freed from those influences, he ventured to say that although they might not gain the adhesion—might indeed meet with the determined opposition—of those who saw in their demands injustice to other classes or far-reaching dangers to the commercial stability of this country, they would earn the respect that was never denied to purity of motive and independence of action.

One thing more, remained to be said about this great majority. It was called a solid English majority. No; it was a Chinese majority. It was a majority gained by the grossest misrepresentations of the subject of Chinese labour in South Africa. These were spread broadcast over the land amongst the working classes, and were aided by the disgraceful pictorial weapons that were now so well known. And it was not only the misrepresentations by word and picture. It was the implied promise that was made, the promise that caused such a wild scene of enthusiasm at the Albert Hall, the promise that hardly a working man who supported them took in any other sense than that a Radical Government the moment they got into power would do away with this horrible thing. The thing which had been denounced for nearly two years, which in the election was held up on every platform, as a hideous, cruel and dishonouring thing to exist under the British flag, as a gift to the mining magnates, as taking the bread out of the mouths of white men in South Africa—yes, and as a thing likely to be introduced into this country—this surely would go like a shot, the moment the Radical Party was put into power. Did the right hon. Gentleman think his lame announcement of last night would satisfy this anticipation? The House really did not know yet what the Government was going to do about it. Was it really to be left to a responsible representative government in the Transvaal? That would secure its continuance, unless the Government were going to rig the constitution they granted, in order to justify their electoral method. That would place the Transvaal permanently in the hands of the Boers. Did they think England, or the Empire would stand that?

What was the real question involved in this matter? It was not white labour. It was not Chinese slavery. The question was whether in a country where the native population outnumbered the white by five to one, the mining industry and all other industries were to be at the mercy of the native population. All other industries which employed white men were dependent on the mining industry. Nine-tenths of the revenue of the country was derived directly from that industry. Even agriculture was dependent upon it for a market for its products. What was the position before Chinese labour was introduced? The mining industry could not get enough Kaffirs to work the mines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did they not pay them better wages?

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS was sure hon. Members would see that after detaining the House so long he could not go into the whole of this question. He could not go into its financial aspects. ["Oh!"]. Very well, he would say briefly that the cost of mining, even with the low wages paid to Kaffir and Chinese unskilled labour, did not even now provide a fair dividend. It did not give a "living wage," so to speak, to the investor. The mining industry tried everywhere. They sent to Central Africa; they sent to the West Coast; but they could not get Kaffirs to carry on that industry.

What did this state of things mean? The country depended on the mining industry. The natives knew that the mining industry, and therefore the country, was in their power. But how little hon. Members opposite considered what it mean for this vast black population to feel that they had the upper hand in one of those countries. "What do they know of England who only England know?" How little did we here, living under law and order, know of the life in those far-off countries which our race had added to the glory of the Crown, but where justice and liberty could only slowly be built up, by first recognising the primitive truth, that "Might is right." How little did we know—whose daily life had the strong arm of the law behind it, and whose rights and property were protected by an ordered executive and a pure judiciary—of the difficulties and anxieties our countrymen had to face with those great native populations, the awful catastrophe that would ensue if once the supremacy of the white man was in danger. That danger was averted by Chinese labour, because it taught the natives that they no longer held the mining industry in the hollow of their hand. On this question of Chinese labour, the Government had placed itself in a cleft stick, and it would remain there, a monument of the folly of any great political Party winning its way to power in this country, not by the promise of sober statesmanship, but by exaggerated appeals to the passions and ignorance of men.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) hoped the hon. Member who last spoke would understand that the cries of dissent which greeted some of his observations were not intended in any discourteous spirit to himself, but were due to the fact that this subject always aroused angry feelings. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would permit him to say that the doctrines he advanced towards the end of his speech were more suitable to a Parliament of 500 years ago than of the present day. The hon. Member had explained that the real reason of the introduction of Chinese labour was to show the Kaffir that he had not the right to sell his labour at what price he pleased—that the whole force of the British Empire was to be used to import blackleg labour to stop a strike. ["No."] He had no wish to misrepresent the hon. Gentleman.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I think you have done so.

MAJOR SEELY: I certainly understood him to say and mean that Chinese labour was introduced in order to prevent the Kaffir from successfully striking for higher wages.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I never said that. I said that Chinese labour was introduced, because Kaffir labour could not be got. At the same time, I explained that I could not go into the financial question, but I did say it was financially impossible for the mining interest to pay higher wages.

MAJOR SEELY said that the hon. Member added that it would be unfortunate if the Kaffir felt, and indeed it was essential he should not believe, that he held the mining industry in the hollow of his hand. The Kaffir had an opportunity of striking for higher wages, and the introduction of Chinese labour deprived him of the opportunity. But the whole question had been dealt with as if it were confined to South Africa. It was all part of the great question of labour and of the restrictions to be placed on employers buying labour in the cheapest market. He would like to be allowed a few moments in order to state the really definite and prominent grounds of their objection to this abominable system, and in doing so perhaps he might be allowed to reply to a question asked by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham on the preceding night. The right hon. Gentleman complained of a cartoon depicting Chinamen in a servile attitude, and he asked if it did not show that the Chinaman was not as free as he was.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.) said he was sorry that the hon. Gentleman should base his argument upon a mistake. What he himself stated to the House was that the cartoon represented the Chinese, with their hands behind their backs, and that he thought it represented them as in a servile position, and was intended to imply that their hands were tied behind their backs. He asked whether the House really thought the Chinaman was intended to be represented as free as he was. His whole point was that, inasmuch as the cartoon led to the belief on the part of a great many people that the Chinaman was in a state of slavery, it was about time to clear it up.

MAJOR SEELY agreed that it was about time to clear it up, and he trusted that they would now be able to do so. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that the Chinese were approximately, broadly speaking, as free as he was. That was the point of his argument—that it was unfair to produce a placard showing the Chinaman not as free as the right hon. Gentleman himself.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Showing them as slaves.

MAJOR SEELY: No, showing them as in a servile position. At last they had an opportunity in that House of stating the case freely, and, as he hoped, with justice and moderation. These men were not free in any single particular, and he thought he would be able to show that from every legal point of view, as apart from a moral point of view, they were in the position of slaves with a time limit. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that slavery consisted of ill-treatment. That was not in the least the case. The first speech that Mr. Gladstone—the greatest upholder of liberty this country had known—delivered was confined to showing that the slaves on the estate of a relative were not ill-treated. Nor were they; but would anybody say the right hon. Gentleman was in favour of slavery. No, the question of ill-treatment had nothing to do with it. Neither did the question whether the condition was voluntary or involuntary necessarily decide the point as to whether it constituted slavery or not. There were certain specific things laid down in British law which all citizens must have as a right; otherwise they were not free men. First, a man could not contract himself out of his right to hold property. That had been the first sign of a free man from the time of ancient Greece until now, and if the right hon. Gentleman would study the innumerable books on constitutional law, he would find the doctrine plainly laid down that to renounce the right to hold property was a badge of slavery. The Chinaman renounced that right by contract. Secondly, a man could not renounce his right to liberty of movement in his spare hours. The Chinaman renounced that right. Thirdly, and perhaps the most important, a man could not renounce his right to raise himself in the social scale by his skill and his industry. That was what the Chinaman did under this contract. Fourthly, a man could not renounce his right to reside where he pleased, and how he pleased at the expiration of his contract. That was the root of the whole evil. It was the desire to exploit the labour of people whom they could not and would not admit as potential citizens, that had caused the trouble, and would cause endless trouble until the whole thing was swept away He begged the right hon. Gentleman to recollect that he was not quoting the opinions of persons who issued leaflets in his constituency, but the opinions of all the great legal authorities, from Lord Mansfield down to the present day. It was indeed strange that a great imperial statesman should have consented to a scheme of labour so degrading that it excluded our own Indian fellow subjects. It had been said that they were not excluded, but he would like to draw attention to a telegram sent in January by Mr. Lyttelton in which he said that the provisions of the Ordinance if applied to Indian subjects would probably be objected to. He was glad to know that, as a fact, they were objected to, for he held that what was not good enough for British Indian subjects ought not to be treated as good enough for any other man, black or yellow. We were not alone in the endeavour to raise the standard of civilisation by revising the treatment of servile labour. In his Message to Congress President Roosevelt, dealing with Hawaii, said—

> "That territory has serious commercial and industrial problems to reckon with, but no measure of relief can be considered which looks to legislation admitting the Chinese and restricting them by statutes to field labour and domestic service. The *status* of servility can never again be tolerated on American soil."

The answer they would make to the right hon. gentlemen the Member for West Birmingham was that it would not be tolerated on British soil either, and when he said that there had been misrepresentation in the matter they would reply that it was true that there had been, but that it had been used by those who had endeavoured to deceive the people into believing that this was a tolerable system, whereas it was a system which the whole American people emphatically condemned. When he asked that the criminals should be punished they must retort that the criminals sat on the Front Bench opposite. [AN HON. MEMBER: Did so.] Well, some of them were no longer Members of the House, but the most important of all sat there now. He supported His Majesty's Government in the action which they had taken, and he was grateful for the reforms announced by the Prime Minister; but one thing more he would ask, and that was that they should not in the same breath say that this thing was intolerable and wrong, and that they would leave it to the responsible Government of the colony to decide whether the wrong should be continued. He was glad that the Prime Minister said yesterday that when he declared that the question of Chinese labour or no Chinese labour was to be referred to the Transvaal, he by no means inferred that the question of the conditions under which that labour was to be allowed was a matter of indifference to the people of this country and to the Empire at large. He only asked that it should be stated clearly and emphatically, and, if possible, before the close of the debate, that the principle on which the British Empire rested was that those who came under the flag, if they were to come under it at all, must be free. It might be said that they could not dictate to a self-governing Colony, but they had done it again and again in far less important matters, and they could easily lay down the principle that "Free or not at all" was the motto of the British Empire. This must be done at once, because delay would only do great harm and continue the uncertainty which now existed. It might be said that free countries did not impose servile conditions, and that in granting a free constitution to the Transvaal it would not be necessary to impose conditions in regard to this. But there was a peculiar danger in the Transvaal which was not wholly free. It was said that there were seven wealthy men in this House who had it in their power to cause great hardships to hundreds of thousands of labouring men. Well, there were five very wealthy men in South Africa who had it in their power to cause infinite suffering to almost every labouring man and woman on the Rand. The Press was not free, the whole country was under a blight, and, therefore, the Government should at once frankly state its ideals of British liberty. It must show it was no longer under the thumb of the mining groups of the Rand. Duty, honour, and wisdom pointed alike to the courageous course, and he earnestly begged the Government to follow it.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): I do not desire to speak at any great length on this question of Chinese labour because I have no doubt there will be discussion on the question at a later stage. But I think that the speech of the hon. and gallant Member raises one of those issues which might with advantage be taken at once. It was pointed out last night that it is not and could not be within the power of a small minority in the House greatly to influence the acts of a powerful Government such as we now see opposed to us. I think, therefore, it is well we should confine ourselves as far as may be to those great issues to which we attach special importance, and should remember that there is entrusted to us as much as to hon. Members opposite the honour of this country to which we all belong. The Prime Minister was a little misinformed when last evening he said that what happened in the recent election was paralleled by what took place at the last general election with regard to the disproportion between the number of votes cast for each Party and the number of Members returned for the same Party. The Prime Minister was not correct in saying that the disproportion was less at the general election just concluded than at any former election. I think the present election forms an unrivalled case and I believe that, strictly speaking, the proportional representation of the Government would be a majority of twenty-five over this side of the House. But, be that as it may, we must be content with the arrangement to which we are accustomed and which is not peculiar to this or that election. The Unionists returned to the present Parliament represent not an inconsiderable minority, but a large and powerful section of opinion which will look to us to voice as continuously as we can what we believe to be their feeling. One of those occasions seems to have arisen now. We are face to face with the discussion of a principle which has been the dividing line betweeen the two Parties since the election began. In the speech of the hon. and gallant Member who has just sat down, I hardly recognise the description which he gave when he said that for the first time we were discussing this question with justice and moderation. I hope some of the speeches previously delivered have been characterised by both justice and moderation. But I want to draw the attention of the House to the very strange doctrine of which we have heard a great deal during the last two days. I speak on behalf of the very small minority in this House, but I speak also on behalf of a great many people in the country who have keenly felt the attacks which have been made upon their countrymen who are not able to defend themselves.

The charge brought against the Unionist Party on the question of Chinese labour is that they have deliberately countenanced the commission of a felony for base purposes, for slavery is a felony under the law of England. The hon. and gallant Member has declared that those who made arrangements by which slavery was carried out came within the penalty of the law. It has been said that slavery exists in British Africa. But is it true that this felony has been committed? We know that the instructions given to commanders of British ships are to capture any ship carrying on the slave trade. Has this been done? The charge I say is a very grave one. Still there is a strange divergence of doctrine on this question of Chinese labour. The Prime Minister did not say that it was slavery; he used a very carefully-guarded phrase and called it a "servile condition." I suppose we may chop logic as to what is a servile condition, but I will undertake to say that the definition may be applied to a great many conditions of labour which all of us accept. In what respect does it differ from the conditions under which natives of our Indian Empire have been employed in other parts of the world? There are differences no doubt. The right hon. Gentleman said the objection was that these people had not the power of return. Is it part of his policy that they should be allowed to remain when their contract is completed? I will go a little further. Another member of the Government, Lord Crewe, speaking last night in the House of Lords, said—

> "I never used the word slavery because I do not regard it as an accurate term, and I do not suppose it was regarded as an accurate term even by those who used it. It is regarded generally as a descriptive term."

That is a very convenient phrase, and if I wanted to find a convenient phrase to indicate something absolutely false, I should now use the expression "a descriptive term." I am not competent to judge between these high authorities. But while the Prime Minister says he does not regard this as slavery, hon. Members opposite say they do so regard it; I want to know by which doctrine we are to stand. I quite agree that the hon. and gallant Member is perfectly logical, and if he is right the Government should not wait another day before this felony is put an end to. If, on the other hand, this "servile condition" is something compatible with the law of England, some apology is due to those who have been compelled day after day to listen to the traducing of their fellowcountrymen for an offence which they have not committed. If the diagnosis of the hon. and gallant Member is correct this is a tremendous disease. What are the remedies considered appropriate to it? It is proposed for one thing that there should be a modification of the Ordinance of 1905. I have referred to that Ordinance and I do not say that the mitigation may not make some difference in the facility with which crimes are punished, or that it may not give opportunities to those accused of crime to bring their case before a superior tribunal That may be a very good and valuable change. The other change proposed is that the coolies should be allowed to go back to their own country and that their expenses should be paid. Is there anything new in that? This very provision was put in by the late Colonial Secretary, and the idea from the first was that these men should be sent back if they desired to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: At their own expense.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is the whole difference. And remember these men are being paid every day of their lives. Now a very pertinent question was asked when this discussion was going on. Someone asked how many will go back.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty per cent.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Member prophesies 30 per cent. That may be correct or incorrect. There have been a great many inaccurate prophecies, but I do not think even if 30 per cent. go back, that very much touches the moral and the legal side of this question. But what I want to call the attention of the House to is this, that we are dealing with great moral accusations made against a people, and the moral obliquity is not wiped out by making two changes of method. Nor do I believe you are going to satisfy those who have supported you and opposed us by the mere promise of a Commission. I am very curious to see what will be the upshot of placing responsibility upon those who have hitherto been such adepts at denunciation. I remember reading in "The Pilgrim's Progress" how Christian had to bear a burden of sin upon his back, and how he was permitted by Divine grace to drop his burden at a certain place and hasten on towards his goal. But I do not remember, in my version at any rate, that when Christian arrived at that happy spot on his toilsome way that he met a traveller and got rid of his burden by saying "Here, mate, take this," and forthwith strapping it firmly on the other's shoulders, and then gaily skipping on his way towards the Celestial Mountains. With all this commission of crime upon us, are we to discharge this burden upon the Transvaal Legislature? The hon. Member who has just sat down was perfectly consistent, and said do not hesitate, and urged that we should use our plenary power now and here. But that is not what the Prime Minister proposes. I understand him to propose one preliminary measure—I do not know that he has accepted it yet—and that was a Commission of Inquiry to go to the Transvaal and ascertain the facts. What facts? Can it be that during the last six weeks this country has been ringing with denunciations, the air has been clouded with charges against our own people, without any knowledge whether these charges are true or not? What are you going to discover? There have been these cartoons distributed. The Prime Minister said with conscious rectitude that in his constituency they used neither colours nor cartoons. I believe there was no opposition in his constituency. But he said with pardonable pride that in his part of the kingdom people voted for Members on account of their opinions, and not because of their cartoons. But I say the sole object of circulating the cartoons is to promulgate your own opinions, and if it be true that those who promulgated this kind of literature did not believe the lesson that was taught by it, it might be well that in Scotland, and out of Scotland, they should be prohibited from using this kind of persuasion at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Birmingham.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not think it carried Birmingham at all. It was the deliberate appeal to argument and reason. In the brilliant speech of the hon. Member for Northampton, for the sake of rounding a period, which in all other respects was finished, he spoke of Birmingham as the Tammany of England. I do not think that remark was as well judged or in as good taste as some other parts of his speech. From my knowledge of Birmingham I think perhaps there is not a place in the United Kingdom which is more singularly unlike Tammany. I have read a report of President Roosevelt's Commission on the question in New York, and I find that the methods of Tammany differ as widely from the methods of Birmingham as black from white, and that the inhabitants of Tammany do not come from Birmingham but from quite another part of the United Kingoom. I do not wish to impart unnecessary heat or matter into my arguments, but I do want in the interests of our Party and of our people both at home and abroad, this question to be cleared up. Does this accusation stand or does it not? It is a most important matter, because if it does stand it is perfectly clear that we cannot hand over the Administration of the Transvaal to a responsible representative Government. There is of course the tendency which has been manifested in this House this evening to get over this difficulty in a way which I believe will least commend itself of all possible methods of extrication. There has been a tendency to wash our hands of this matter by transferring it, not to a constitutional Government in the

Transvaal on the lines on which we should desire to see it established, but to gerrymander the Transvaal Legislature so that we may be sure of a verdict consonant with the view which hon. Members took at the election. I cannot but believe that this country would repudiate any conduct of this kind. There is a point beyond which goodwill, affection, and the love of our species ought not to go. We have heard cited in this House an illustration of the extraordinary generosity of our proceedings in dealing with the South African Republic. There was the example of the United States, which for ten years withheld from the rebellious South the privilege of the franchise. Then there is another case, in which the German Empire, engaged in a war with an enemy who crossed its frontier, at the close of a victorious war gave no legislature to their conquered provinces or any equal franchise, but said that by a certain date every man must elect whether he would be a German subject or clear out of the country, and that every man who remained should serve compulsorily in the German Army, and every child above six should be educated, whether the parents wished it or not, at a German school. I do not cite these examples to suggest that they should be imitated or followed, but I do suggest that the common prudence of all nations does point in this direction, that you should bear in mind whether what you are doing will lead to the final prosperity of our Empire, of those for whom you are legislating; and, if it be in the minds of hon. Members opposite that it is the right way to solve this problem, to get rid of this difficulty by making sacrifices of that kind, then I do entreat them to pause and think what may be the price of what they are paying, even for the security and happiness of their conscience. I do want to know which of these courses we are really to be asked to pursue. Are we really asked to believe that all these charges which have been made are true, or are we to be asked to believe that they have been grossly exaggerated? Hon. Members opposite have been far too careless in aspersing the good fame of their country. These accusations have gone the length and breadth of the earth. They have been quoted in foreign newspapers and have been cited against us as the deliberate act of our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, the late Government.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: In the first place it does not make the slightest difference. When you are making an attack upon the nation, and you cite the case of their Government before foreign countries, you create, and intend to create, the feeling that that nation is doing another injustice.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Even allowing that not to be the case, who are the men who have been held up to reprobation?

AN HON. MEMBER: You.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, the accusation made by the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool, with regard to the Leader of the Opposition, entirely falls to the ground. He was not responsible.

MAJOR SEELY: Surely he was responsible. He might have protested and did not.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The phrase used by the hon. and gallant Member was that the principal criminal was my right hon. friend. I do not think the phrase was felicitous, and I am sure the accusation falls to the ground. We are too ready—hon. Members on the other side are too ready—for a Party advantage, to asperse generally the character of this country. Would it not have been better before this cry had gone out the length and breadth of the world that we had had this Commission of Inquiry? We all recognised that the right hon. Gentleman spoke with great caution, prudence, and circumspection last night. He said this was a very difficult and complicated question. He said that, above all, they felt they were brought into this question without knowledge, and that they must ascertain whether the charges are true. [Cries of "No."] Then I may assume that the right hon. Gentleman does support them because he knows they are true? I am sure if I misrepresent the Prime Minister I greatly regret it, but I do not think I do substantially misrepresent him, because it is perfectly clear that the whole question of the new administration in South Africa is undoubtedly bound up with these matters, and if we are to have utterances, one on behalf of the Government, and one on behalf of independent Members, showing there is a clear divergence of opinion on this question, it would have been better to wait, and not to make these charges until they were proved.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said he understood that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon was the champion of Chinese labour in South Africa, because he apparently justified all the late Government had done there, and was proud of their achievements. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham until he was elected—and opinions changed after elections, sometimes—was not so keen a supporter of Chinese labour, and took a more tentative view of it, but after the election he became an ardent supporter of it.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Can the hon. Gentleman quote any distinction between my opinions upon Chinese labour at any time?

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: Upon Chinese labour of course; the other general question is too big a one to be answered off-hand. It is early in the afternoon, and the House does not sit after midnight. The right hon. Gentleman said he was not responsible for Chinese labour in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is true.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: That surprises me, because, if it were a thing of which the right hon. Gentleman was proud, why should he not accept, not the responsibility of a Minister, but the responsibility of a memberof the rank and file of the Conservative Party—I beg his pardon, the Protectionist Party. [At this stage Mr. CHAMBERLAIN left the House.] The right hon. Gentleman had often changed his mind, but he had now moved his body from the House, a matter not altogether to be deplored. It would have been more courteous of the right hon. Gentleman—not that he was any standard of courtesy—if, having asked a question, he had waited for the reply. The right hon. Gentleman said that he was not responsible for Chinese labour, and he did not defend it. That completely justified what he had said. During the time the contest was waging in Birmingham, and when the right hon. Gentleman was not sure what was going to happen, he took a more tentative view of Chinese labour than he had subsequently taken in this House. There was one very valuable gem in the speech of the hon. Member for Westminster. He said that might was right. They had might now on the Ministerial side of the House, and he supposed the hon. Member would agree that they were right on every subject.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: Yes, and I would point out that I applied that phrase to untutored and ignorant people —in South Africa perhaps.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said he applied it to the other side of the House. He did not, however, rise to take part in the general debate upon Chinese labour in South Africa. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon was returned for that constituency owing to circumstances entirely beyond his control; his return was due less to himself than to the fact that there were two candidates against him. No doubt he would continue to champion Chinese labour, just as they would continue to resist it on the Ministerial side of the House. As a Welsh Member he desired to say that he was exceedingly pleased with the programme of reforms in the King's Speech. There was one great attribute about the new House of Commons, and it was that they were in earnest about work being done; and although it was true that ten years ago Home Rule stood first, and Welsh Disestablishment second—and he would not quarrel with his hon. friends for Ireland as to the position in which Home Rule stood now —he wished to state that the absence of Welsh Disestablishment from the King's Speech did not trouble him at this stage, because the late Government had created such arrears of legislation that it was necessary for the present Government to deal with them at once. There was the Education Act, the Taff Vale decision, and the Unemployed Act. For his own part he did not complain that these matters had taken precedence even of Welsh Disestablishment. Both Mr. Balfour and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had referred to Welsh Disestablishment as being an issue before the country, and therefore they were now estopped from denying that the verdict of the country had been in favour of Welsh Disestablishment. He had always been a moderate man. He did not ask that Welsh Disestablishment should be dealt with first or second, but as long as it was understood that the Government had a mandate to deal with it when the opportunity arose, he was willing to leave the matter to the Government to determine. With regard to education he submitted that Wales presented an opportunity for exceptional treatment, and an opportunity would arise when there might be created a Board of Education for Wales to deal with elementary, secondary and university education. This would not be the first time that Wales had received distinctive treatment. The Leader of the Irish Party had referred to the great majority of four out of every five of the Irish Members being Nationalists, but in Wales the proportion was five out of five, and for the first time in the history of this country, the Principality had returned a solid phalanx of thirty-four supporters of His Majesty's Government. He assured the House that not one of those thirty-four Members could have been elected had he not been a supporter of Disestablishment and Disendowment in Wales. Under those circumstances no doubt the Government would take this question into account. He hoped they would sit late into August, and even into September, to pass the measures contained in the King's Speech. He was interested in this question because he did not expect Disestablishment until the arrears of legislation had been cleared off. In spite of this omission, he was glad to support His Majesty's Government in the programme of reforms foreshadowed and embodied in the King's Speech.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) said that before this irregular discussion came to an end, he wished to make some observations in reference to Ireland. Apart from anything in the King's Speech, or in the speech of the Prime Minister last night, there was one thing which would give very considerable satisfaction in Ireland, and that was the great amount of sympathy with Ireland exhibited during the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford by the great and practically all-powerful majority now established in this House to undertake great social and political reforms both in this country and Ireland. The Irish question, he wished to point out, had been completely transformed within the last ten years in a direction just the opposite to that contemplated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham by the passing of the Act for the abolition of landlordism. This was a matter which was not fully grasped in this country, because the process was a silent one; but the change was there, and it would be a lasting one. They would no longer be occupied as the late Mr. Parnell was occupied, rightly and triumphantly, for many years in this House, when he was forced to depend upon merely fighting one English Party against another, and to fight under the terrible disadvantage that a fourth of his own countrymen were divided from his Party not merely by political sentiments but by their material interests, by their regard for their pockets in the monopoly they enjoyed of all place and all power in Ireland. All this was now changed, and changed in a way that there could be no going back upon. He was aware that some people consoled themselves by thinking that it was the Nationalists, or at least he himself, who had changed. He was not greatly alarmed at the imputation. If there was any necessity for it nothing would be easier than to show that it was not they but both the great English Parties who had changed from the old days when the Nationalists had their hand against every man and every man's hand against them. It might perhaps be permissible for him at all events to remind hon. Gentlemen above the gangway who were still of opinion that their remaining demands were very dreadful, that every Irish Act of Parliament passed during the last twenty years had been a sort of act of contrition of this House of Commons, that there had been as many Tory Acts of contrition as Liberal, that every Act of Parliament that had been passed had been a confession in the main that the representatives of Ireland were right and that the demands of Ireland were just and reasonable, and that all the terrors and bogeys which they heard conjured up here long ago when they asked for expropriation of the landlords and for the management of their own affairs, at all events, had not had the effects predicted of shaking the foundations of the Empire. He thought it would be found, even by the most reactionary gentlemen above the gangway, that as soon as they had conceded, as they would have to concede within a few years, the full extent of their demands, the results would be satisfactory. Whether British or Irish Members had changed he did not care a brass farthing, so long as the change was in the right direction and so long as the happy result was that they were no longer obliged to discuss Irish questions on a war footing, either in this House or in Ireland. A good element of hope for the future was that both the great English parties had co-operated in those great legislative changes and in the revolution that had taken place in regard to Ireland. No matter what might be the fate of Parties for the moment, he trusted that in the end they would co-operate in the development of that legislation. It might be all very well for the highly respectable, but rather decaying, section of Irish gentlemen who would not have Home Rule, and who thought that Devolution was even worse than Home Rule, to look, as the Dublin correspondent of *The Times* said they were looking, to that eminent Irish patriot the right hon. Member for South Dublin to lead a forlorn hope for them in this House. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having found refuge in South Dublin, which might fairly be described, so far as he was concerned, as Dublin Castle by the Sea. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having been more successful with the Castle officials and their fellow residents in South Dublin than with his more inappreciative fellow countrymen. He did not dispute the right hon. Gentleman's ability or pluck, but with all his ability and pluck he would not be able to expunge from the statute book the Acts of Parliament which his own Government had passed. He would point out that whereas some years ago a minority in Ireland possessed the whole of the government of the country and had thousands of places at their disposal, and were consequently bound to fight tooth and nail against popular government, popular government had now come to stay in Ireland. Although no doubt the gentlemen who elected the right hon. Member for South Dublin might be too elderly to accept the new order of ideas, he doubted whether the right hon. and gallant Member for Armagh would deny the likelihood that their sons in the next generation who had to live in Ireland would learn that lesson gladly enough. A few years ago the landlords in Ireland depended absolutely upon England for the means of carrying out their cruel and oppressive rights as landlords. It was scarcely too much to say that they depended literally for their daily bread on Dublin Castle. That also was changed now. In four or five years there would no longer be Irish landlords. Those who had been Irish landlords would have as substantial an interest as any in such matters as reducing the police establishment, and in dealing with Dublin Castle. There would, he ventured to say, be union on these subjects. Let him point out further that, up to the present the time of this House had been largely occupied by members of one English Party criticising and reproaching the opposite Party, for treating with the Irish Party. But the Tories were now as much implicated as the Liberals, and he only wished that they had been allowed to implicate themselves a little more deeply. He was confident that there were men amongst them, he did not know in the House of Commons, but at all events in another place, whom every impulse of decency as well as of broad-minded statesmanship would impel for the future to co-operate with the Government in their Irish policy. He did not think there would be any anything in the attitude of the people of Ireland, or of the Irish Party, to raise any jarring note, or to increase the difficulties that no doubt stood in the way. They had never attempted to mislead the English people or Government as to the true nature of the Irish demand, which was for representative, and responsible government in purely Irish affairs—nothing more and nothing less. Upon that point there was no shadow of difference of opinion amongst the Nationalist representatives of Ireland. They might have differed up to the present on matters of laches, but as to the main principle there was not, and could not be, any divergence amongst Irish Nationalists. They were united as one man in the view that responsible self-government, which was, or was about to be, enjoyed by every other community of European origin in the King's realms, should be conceded to Ireland. It was no longer necessary to go on protesting the full measure of their rights. Tory as well as Liberal had now entered upon a policy of concession to Ireland in which they could not stop. On the other hand he, for one, recognised that they had incurred responsibilities which would compel them to make allowance for the difficulties of the Government and not to adopt an aggressive attitude so long as they felt that they were being treated with good feeling and good faith, and according to the measure of the possibilities of situation. He had no fear that the moderation of Ireland would be mistaken for any recantation or want of backbone. They were far from saying that the millennium had come or was in the least likely to come. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford on the previous night, in language that was most truthful and most eloquent, pictured the condition of acute suffering and depression under which the country was suffering. It was at this time the worst governed and most overburdened and the most decaying country in Europe, but he for one felt that in view of the work of the next few years—the work of completing the abolition of landlordism, and of transforming the government into national self-government—it was their interest, just as much as that of English Members, to make straight their paths by gradually allaying any suspicions and old prejudices that might still remain in England and in Ulster, and to proceed to a certain extent in the experimental way towards larger measures of self-government, which must be the ultimate aim of wise legislation. For his part it was just because he felt confident as to the successful results of trusting Ireland that he was willing to proceed by degrees so long as the Government, with the gigantic power that was behind them, did not ask them to go by too slow degrees, so that the urgent questions of taxation and emigration would not have to stand over for an unreasonable period. It would be a waste of energy at that stage to discuss what might be the plans announced in the King's Speech or to enter into any controversies as between Home Rule and Devolution. These were mere quarrels about words, mere castles in the air. If Englishmen and Irishmen meant to arrive at an agreement in the interests of England as well as of Ireland, some great scheme for adjusting the legislative arrangements between the countries ought to be arrived at. Practical statesmanship had not fallen so low on either side of the House that any insurmountable difficulties could arise in arriving at a sensible settlement and one which he made bold to prophesy would cause less wrench to old Tory prejudices than was required by a Tory Government when they abolished the Grand Jury rule and signed the death warrant of landlordism in Ireland. As an opinion of his own, which he held very strongly, he might be allowed to say that in his judgment they had already the germ of the eventual settlement of Irish affairs between Irishmen in the Land Conference to which, and to the Land Purchase Act, the almost unanimous sanction of both English Parties had been given. By some such machinery as that, the two or three most urgent questions could be dealt with. First of all the Labourers Act, and he congratulated the Government on its expressed intention to deal with that question. Then there was the settlement of the great Univerity question upon the broadest and most democratic basis. There was also the question that the Estates Commissioners should be freed from the shackles which the late Chief Secretary and his law officers had placed upon them. As to the necessity for an amending Purchase Bill all were agreed, and no one who had studied the question would doubt that on two of those vital questions an agreement among all parties and sections of Irishmen could be arrived at, as in the case of the Land Bill. There were difficulties, but whatever difficulty some of his friends might have had in the beginning in accepting a principle, which he agreed was more or less a rough and ready way of dealing with matters, he was satisfied that it would prove the way of arriving at a solution with the least possible amount of friction. He submitted that this would be the best possible way of getting valuable urgent

Irish legislation through the House of Commons with the least possible delay, and it also afforded an unanswerable argument of the capacity of Irishmen to manage their own affairs with justice and generosity to one another. All he could say was, that if the Chief Secretary would only recommend such conferences upon these questions as they arose and recommend them as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover recommended them, by promising to the best of his power to give effect to them, as he could easily do, he would go a long way towards a solution, and he would obtain actual experience as to how they would work. Every successful agreement come to by Irishmen among themselves would make it easy to transform those informal conferences into constitutional assemblies for the transaction of important business. He would be delighted to address a few words of respectful warning to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover if he were present, and they would be that he should not allow himself to become the victim of what was a very despicable party manœuvre to try and retrieve the fortunes of the Tory Party by turning upon Ireland. He thought the right hon. Gentleman's best friends would advise him that instead of repudiating the course of action he had taken on a previous occasion, he should avow, and glory in the avowal, the full force of the Irish policy he had adopted. Whatever might be said of the misunderstandings of the moment, it would be the most enduring monument of his career and the highest feather in his cap that a new Government filled with friendship to Ireland could find no better lines to go upon than those on which he had pursued. He (Mr. O'Brien) had never concealed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman was not solely or even principally at fault for the breakdown in the administration of the Land Act or as to the failure of the Labourers Bill and the settlement of the University question. He need not go into this, but one thing he felt perfectly certain of was that his policy and that of Lord Dudley was, with the exception of Lord Lansdowne's foreign policy, the only achievement of permanent policy and success of the late Government. The right hon. Gentleman would be doing great service if he made up his mind manfully to co-operate with the new Chief Secretary in completing the work to which he and Lord Dudley made a contribution that never would be forgotten. The Chief Secretary might rely upon it the more he inquired the more he would find that there were permanent elements of conciliation in the Irish Unionist body, among many landlords and Orange men and Presbyterian farmers of the north. The Chief Secretary would find this a permanent and growing element full of promise and promoting a better and broader spirit among the people. Whatever might be the difficulties of the Chief Secretary when he came over to govern Ireland as a stranger—and he did not say a stranger in any invidious sense, because the right hon. Gentleman was entitled to regard himself as at home in Ireland—still he came as the representative of an unworkable and indefensible system of Government—he would have the good will of all Parties. He would have at his back a gigantic majority in this House animated with good will towards Ireland. He would also find a state of good feeling in Ireland in which there was an almost unanimous determination to give him fair play and every reasonable co-operation in the way of a tranquil country, which was the most peaceable in the world, anxious for conciliation, ready unquestionably to have the ties between all classes and creeds drawn more closely together, and willing to labour in getting rid of whatever reasonable objection might still remain in the minds of Englishmen or Irishmen. That was a very great advantage, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would turn it to good account, and that with liberal and courageous efforts, he would give Ireland promptly those great measures to which he had referred. The right hon. Gentleman could make them, practically speaking, non-contentious measures and could clear the way to complete self-government. If the right hon. Gentleman did that he would render to England the best of all services. English statesmen on both sides of the House had learned the lesson that the time of peacefulness, friendliness and conciliation in Ireland was the time to prove that the hopes of the Irish people would not be disappointed and that their friendliness would not be misunderstood.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that the case of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in regard to Chinese labour appeared to be that Ministerialists were a set of unctuous hypocrites, who with their tongues in their cheeks used the question for all it was worth at the general election, and were now prepared to leave the coolie in the state of labour which they had described as slavery. The speech of the Prime Minister the previous evening knocked the bottom out of the whole suggestion and was a crushing reply to the accusation. He heard that speech with the greatest sense of relief and satisfaction. What was it that the Premier suggested should be done, pending the creation of the final fabric of self-government in the Transvaal? The Government had altered one or more of the punitive clauses of the Ordinance, but he hoped that the alteration of it would proceed much further than that, and that it would be overhauled from beginning to end, so that if there was anything it in which pressed upon the coolie as a human being it would be removed. In the second place the Government were prepared to pay the expense of the repatriation of the coolie who did not wish to stay in South Africa. These suggestions carried them very far along the line of reform, especially as the Government had announced that there should be no further importation of coolies. He would suggest, however, that the Administration should go one step further and say that the clause which related to re-enlistment of coolies after three years' service for another three years should be struck out. It was in the interest of this great nation and the honour of the great Liberal Party that the indentured Chinese coolies should stay in South Africa as short a time as possible. In his judgment, the Leader of the Opposition presented a diverting spectacle when he stood at the Table and lifted his hands in pious horror at certain cartoons issued during the general election. The right hon. Gentleman must have an uncommonly short memory. He thought they on their side could produce some highly coloured cartoons which were issued by the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham belonged at the 1900 election, at the time of the Khaki fever, which depicted every Liberal as an enemy to his country and a traitor to the soldier in the field. He thought the right hon. Gentleman's speech was a classic instance of the pot calling the kettle black, and there he left it. It was curious how everybody got very angry when the word "slavery" was used; but he had said that this system of indentured Chinese labour was slavery. He had called it slavery both inside and outside the House, and he still called it slavery. The Government had been called upon to clear up one of the greatest messes in English history. He would quote one or two things which had led him to call it slavery. He would read a description of the landing of the first batch of Chinese coolies at Durban in June, 1904, by the S.S. "Tweedale"—

> "The landing place was guarded with a strong body of police; a floating cordon of water police remained permanently round the ship; police with loaded rifles paraded her decks and the wharves. The coolies were photographed, their thumb impressions taken, and they were registered under armed supervision. It further appeared that the coolies were sent up to Johannesburg in locked carriages under armed escort."

He called that slavery. But he would take official documents, from which it appeared that the late Government promised the Chinese Government that there should be no corporal punishment except under the ordinary law. What happened? Until Questions were asked in this House and indignation arose, they were flogged wholesale. The late manager of a compound in July last made the statement—

> "He had in many cases flogged Chinese coolies. He knew it was against the law, but he had done it."

He would also quote the statement of Mr. H. Boland as to the flogging of coolies, published in the *Morning Leader* last September which had never been seriously challenged; Mr. Boland was a most reliable witness.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Did Mr. Boland publish those figures?

DR. MACNAMARA said he did not know what the figures were. He was like the Prime Minister; he had not seen everything. But Mr. Boland's statements had not been seriously challenged. If, however, it was not agreeable to refer to the *Morning Leader* perhaps he might be permitted to refer to the organ of the Transvaal Licensed Victuallers' Association in regard to what they published on the 29th April, 1905. He should not himself put up the organ as an altogether reliable source of information, but perhaps it would not be challenged on the other side. It said—

> "Twenty coolies are lined up outside the compound manager's office. They are marched in, one by one, by Chinese policemen, and charged. The charge may be anything—from malingering to opium-smoking, or failing to report after a shift. The sentence usually varies from five to fifty strokes. These are administered variously. In one compound that I visited the punishment is carried out most expeditiously. 'Ten,' says the compound manager, speaking in Chinese, and the unhappy coolie walks to another part of the same room, between two or three Chinese policemen, to take his gruel."

He called that slavery. Moreover, the sequel to Blue-book 2,563 showed that between July, 1904, and April, 1905—ten months—the total number of convictions was 1,356, including desertions, 103; refusing to work, 100; travelling without permit, 139; refusing to work and inciting to riot, fifty-three. If the convictions were taken month by month, the proportion of them was 5,000 a year, and out of 50,000 coolies. That was not a state of things they could view with equanimity. The Party opposite had got the country into this mess. They had brought the country to the very verge of ruin and squandered money and blood, and now they really asked too much of the Government, and blamed them because they could not get rid of the result of this action in five minutes. He thought the Prime Minister had shown great circumspection and care, but considered that it would have been fair if some of the money for sending these people back to their homes had come out of the pockets of the Rand millionaires. If they had the £30,000,000 promised by the Member for West Birmingham, they could have dealt with the whole matter no doubt to the right hon. Gentleman's satisfaction.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince) said it was not in any spirit of carping criticism or factious opposition that he rose to call attention to the nature of the Address which had been moved. He was quite sure that every Member of his Party recognised with exceeding satisfaction the extremely useful list of measures contained in the Speech from the Throne, which they hoped would in due time reach legislative enactment. The question of Chinese labour was after all not a question of the coolie alone, but one of the highest moral significance. It was a question of the degradation of labour, and they could not conceive that the action suggested by the Government was one that sufficiently met the requirements of the case. In it they found no mention of the fact that re-enlistment should cease, nor did they find any mention of any definite action which was to be taken with regard to the licences issued in November last. That was a matter of extreme gravity, because they believed that those 13,199 licences issued in the first and second week of November last year were issued largely in contravention of the will of the late Government and largely in defiance of what might be taken to be the express command of the Government. On October 27th the late Colonial Secretary sent a telegram to Lord Selborne, suggesting that, for six months at least, they might voluntarily stop the importation of Chinese labour, and he thought when a right hon. Gentleman occupying the high and responsible position of Secretary of State for the Colonies suggested that voluntary action should be taken to stop the importation of Chinese labour and that no re-enlistment should go on for a period of six months, such a suggestion was entitled to the highest and most respectful consideration. Yet within a fortnight of the sending of that telegram to Lord Selborne, they found 13,199 licences were issued. In reply to the

Colonial Secretary's request for information as to the reason why such an unprecedented issue had taken place, the right hon. Gentleman was told it was due to the steady and continuous expansion of the industry. He, however, contended that the figures of the previous months entirely displaced or overrode the statement furnished by Lord Selborne. The figures of the licences issued in the previous eight months were January 4225, February 5,374, March *nil*, April 1,931, May 3,477, June 2,285, July 1,529, August 2,221, September *nil*, October 2,351. Those figures gave an average of 2,924 per month for the previous eight months. The Whigs were dished in 1867, but then they were dished by a great historic Party, but on this occasion the Liberals had been dished by persons who were largely foreigners, whose names were unpronounceable by English tongues, and with whom the people of this country had no sympathy. He protested with all his heart against this outrage which had been committed in South Africa. The Government had been informed by the Attorney-General that it would not now be possible to revoke the licences already granted, although they had been granted under the conditions he had described, and the reason given by the Government itself was that such an act would be arbitrary and would, in Lord Selborne's opinion, leave a feeling of injustice. How could they in these circumstances describe the action of the Chamber of Mines itself, which met on February 12th, and decided in the face of the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary that the necessities of the mines required 13,000 coolies? Such an act did not demand lenient treatment at the hands of this House. Such an action on the contrary called for very strong action on the part of the House. They might on this point say with Shakespeare—

> "That indeed to do a great right we should do a little wrong."

on this occasion and curb these cruel devils of their will. They certainly ought to ask the Government, to whom he and those who sat with him were willing to give loyal support so long as they took the overwhelming claims of labour into fair and sympathetic consideration, for an inquiry into the whole of this question, and that the Government should say that under the present circumstances these licences should not come into operation. They regretted that the Government had departed so much from the attitude of great moral courage adopted by Lord Elgin in his request that the question of the importation of Chinese labour should be reserved pending the decision as to granting responsible Government to the colonies—an attitude which he emphasised when he stated further that His Majesty's Government was not prepared under all circumstances to be responsible for further importation. They believed the justice of the case could only be met by preventing re-enlistment and by abrogating the conditions which allowed re-enlistment after the coolie had done his term of three years, and they most earnestly hoped the Government would agree to a free and unfettered inquiry into all the conditions which at present existed, and that pending such inquiry no more of these licences should come into active operation. Lord Selborne had stated that 3,000 more licences were issued in December and that they ought to come into operation in the same way as the 13,000. He was glad to see that the Government had prevented those coming into operation. But he noticed that Lord Selborne had said that there would be a strong feeling that injustice had been done if they were not allowed to come in. What was the mind and the feeling of the British labourers who were now walking about the Transvaal depending on soup kitchens, charity, and relief works for an existence? He submitted that the Liberal Party ought to rise to the height of this great question. Those who had not previously been acquainted with the customs of this House were quite aware that they would meet with many curious things, but they never thought to hear from the lips of so competent an authority as the hon. Member for Westminster such a fine description of the principle and policy of eighteenth century brigandage in this House. The hon. Member preached the doctrine that might is right.

> "The good old rule, the simple plan that they should take who had the power and they should keep who can."

They could not agree to that doctrine. Might was not right. Might had brought all the evil from which humanity suffered. They appealed to the Prime Minister, the honoured, revered, and distinguished Leader of the House, and through him to the great Party who were proud to serve under his command, not to heed the prospects which were held out by interested spectators in South Africa. He hoped they would arrest further importation, and give a full, open, and unfettered inquiry, and see to it that re-enlistments under the Ordinance were abrogated, and that when the men's term of service expired they were drafted home whence they came, at the expense of the mineowners, and not of the National Exchequer.

*SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he challenged the statement of the hon. manufacturer who moved the Address that the result of the recent election showed that the people of this country were against fiscal reform. He challenged it for a variety of reasons which had already been brought to the knowledge of the House, but he had in his own case a very special instance of it. If there was a constituency in the whole of the country in which the battle of fiscal reform was the main issue at the election it was certainly Central Sheffield. He never issued a document or said a word which was not upon the subject of fiscal reform. His opponent described himself as the Secretary of the Free Trade Union, but what was remarkable in all his speeches and addresses was the extremely wide berth he gave to the subject of fiscal reform. When the hon. Member for St. Pancras was making his Motion he (Sir Howard) said Chinese labour was the issue which had largely affected great masses of people in many constituencies. He held a document which was issued by the Secretary of the Free Trade Union, not upon fiscal matters, but entirely upon this question of Chinese labour. What had that to do with fiscal reform which the hon. Gentleman said had been definitely decided by the people of this country? They on the Opposition side of the House knew there was a great majority against them, but they did not find by any means that in the country there was the large number of votes against them which the state of the majority would lead one to suppose. In English constituencies 2,163,030 votes were cast for Liberal and Radical candidates against 2,086,222 for Conservative and Unionist candidates, giving a majority of only 76,808 votes. It was utterly absurd in face of this and in face of the results in many Midland cities to say that the fiscal question had been finally decided by the country. In the Speech from the Throne there was this extraordinary paragraph:—

> "I note with satisfaction that the imports and exports of the country continue to show a steady and accelerating increase, and, together with the growing activity of trade at home, indicate that the industries of my people are, in general, in a sound and progressive condition."

This paragraph was followed by a reference to the vast amount of unemployment which existed in the country. Could anyone have heard the Speech of the Leader of the Nationalist Party without recognising the enormous harm which had been done to the industries of Ireland alone by our absurd free imports system during the past sixty years? Yet His Majesty's Government lumped together the imports and exports, the sales and the purchases, and by taking the gross total said that represented a satisfactory condition of things, and in the next paragraph they talked of the great amount of unemployment. Was any account whatever taken, in the Speech or in the paragraph, of the enormous increase which had come upon this country in recent years in the importation of foreign manufactured goods? There could be no question whatever that the importation of these competing goods had a very great tendency to throw our own people out of employment. A return issued a short time ago by the Board of Trade showed that the value of foreign articles wholly or mainly manufactured, imported, and consumed in the United Kingdom, was roughly, in 1860, £50,000,000; in 1870, £40,000,000; in 1880, £54,000,000; in 1890, £63,000,000; in 1900, £95,000,000; in 1902, £101,000,000; and in 1905, £140,000,000 sterling, and this was the condition of affairs which His Majesty's

Government viewed with intense satisfaction. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the other day that he could not find money for old age pensions. No wonder hon. Gentlemen below the gangway denounced the Answer as highly unsatisfactory. Put a tax upon these goods and there was the money for old age pensions. The importation of these competing goods threw our own people out of employment. On the 1st March a new German tariff would come into force against us. What was His Majesty's Government doing as regarded this German tariff?

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Nothing.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: That observation comes from the late Secretary of the Cobden Club.

MR. MYER: No; it came from a manufacturer who imports foreign iron to employ labour in England.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: That is exceedingly interesting. Here is a manufacturer of iron, I presume, for the British market.

MR. MYER: And for the foreign.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said that was better still. The hon. Gentleman appeared to delight in the statement that a new German tariff was to come against this country next week. He understood the hon. Member approved of the tariff. Well, he held in his hand a statement as regarded the German tariff as it would affect the industries of his constituents. In the case of files, the tariff was to increase from 7s. 6d. to 20s. per cwt., and he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider how this increase would affect the Sheffield manufacturer of files. The people he sympathised with were his unfortunate constituents. He did not wonder that hon. Members opposite thought his constituents were unfortunate, but at all events they had a Member who knew his own mind and spoke it, and one who voiced the interest of his constituents whenever he found an opportunity of doing so. This was a case in point. Here was an article which was one of the staple trades of Sheffield, and what steps were the Government taking in the interests of the file cutters of Sheffield who were aggrieved by this new German tariff? Then there was a new Russian tariff. Recently the President of the Local Government Board had addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Free Trade Union in which he spoke of the "made-in-Germany" folly, and so on. He wished to know what steps were being taken in the interests of the workers to secure that free access to the Russian and German markets which was given to Russian and German products in the markets of this country. The remark made by the hon. Member opposite, who was a manufacturer himself, would surely lead to a considerable increase in those tariffs. Foreign tariffs prevented them having that free access to foreign markets which they gave to foreign products in this country, and consequently it diminished the demand for English goods whilst at the same time it increased the wealth and productiveness of foreign countries. Why was there this great outcry against the competition of Germany if the protective system had not led to the enormous wealth and productive power of Germany? He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would confer with the hon. manufacturer opposite and then tell the House definitely and clearly what steps were being taken against the new German and Russian tariffs to prevent foreign nations from creating this unfair competition and saying—"Now there is a Government in power in England which does not care what we do; we can do anything we like and impose any burdens we desire, because the British Government is delighted with the present state of the import and export trade."

*MR. STUART (Sunderland) said he was sure they could all see why the hon. Member for Sheffield had won a victory in spite of a determined opposition. It was due to the enthusiasm which he had thrown into this question and which extended back almost into the dark ages of political reminiscence, long before the present Opposition Bench were converted to his views. There was a youthful vivacity about the hon. Member opposite which he was sure they were all delighted to see; and if someone had to be returned from Sheffield in the interest of those views they rejoiced that it was the hon. Member opposite. Of course, this debate touched only slightly the various phases of the fiscal question, but he wished to point out how lightly the hon. Member skimmed over some of the difficulties which perhaps in his enthusiasm he did not see. He found fault with the Government because there was a reference to exports and imports in the King's Speech. His great Leader, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, said categorically that the exports formed the criterion of a country's prosperity. Would the hon. Member opposite say that the imports ought not to increase as well? He had forgotten to tell them of the increase in the exports of manufactured goods from this country. He also appeared to forget that whatever they got from a foreign country they had got to pay for it by sending something out, and therefore his argument was not fully sustained. The hon. Member for Sheffield was opposed to the importation of these manufactured goods which he said ought to be taxed, and he desired to tax them in order to keep them out of the country, because he said they were taking the bread out of the mouths of British workpeople. It was rather remarkable that the hon. Member then turned to the Labour Members and said—"This is where I am going to give you money, by taxing these foreigners." If they were going to keep out those foreign goods, how would they be able to raise money by taxing them? And if they came into this country in spite of the tax, then the object of the hon. Member opposite would not be achieved, because he desired to keep those goods out of this country. The hon. Member was mistaken in his statement that the King's Speech referred to a terrible increase in the number of unemployed. There was a statement that something would be done to amend the Unemployed Bill. The hon. Member had thrown out, incidentally, words as to the enormous number of the unemployed in this country, but he would challenge him to look at the pauperism returns as well as the returns of unemployment, and then say that they had not been going on better of late years than they did before. Take the imports of foreign manufactured goods into this country and lay beside them the percentages of unemployed, and if the hon. Member could find any relation whatever between them he would pay him the greatest possible compliment.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I will accept that challenge.

MR. STUART said he did not wish anyone to suppose that because he said that there was a decrease in pauperism and want of employment that they should not do something to improve the present condition of things. He hoped to see great remunerative public works commenced which would be a great advantage to the nation, before this question was laid aside altogether. Such works would help to feed the poor and give employment to the poorest labourers in the country, to whom their sympathy was justly more extended recently than to any other class of the community. It was not known to many hon. Members of this House how Bill after Bill had passed both Houses for reclaiming large portions of the Wash by means of which thousands of acres had been reclaimed, and there was at present a Bill which had not been carried into effect, for reclaiming another 100,000 acres. This was promoted by a private company for profit, which showed that it must be an advantage to the community to carry out such projects. There were many opportunities for carrying on works of this character, and he trusted some further inquiry would be made by the Members of this House, before they left the consideration of the question. He believed that those who had to deal with these matters were sympathetic towards making such inquiry as he had described. With regard to the equalisation of rates, he thought that as he was the author of a Bill which was passed with that special object he might point out that there were several concurrent methods for equalising rates in London. One or another of these methods would be proposed by the Government. He urged that the equalisation of the rates of London should be accompanied by an arrangement which would give to a central authority greater control in future over the expenditure of the rates. Coming back to this House, as he had done, after five or six years' absence, he could not but observe the great spirit of reality there was in this House, and the great desire now to do something for the benefit of the people of England and Ireland and our Colonies, and more especially for the poorer portion of the people. He congratulated the Prime Minister on the King's Speech and on his own statements supplementing what the Speech contained. The right hon. Gentleman was making an earnest and honest attempt to meet the situation. He trusted the measures which would be brought before the House would be pushed along so that they would not waste their energies. He hoped that the House would use its energies in getting good legislation, and that the measures mentioned in the King's Speech would be dealt with in an efficient manner, even if they had a long session. There were many things he was interested in which were not referred to in the King's Speech. There were, for instance, the questions of the taxation of ground values and the provision of old age pensions. He hoped that when six and three-quarter years were over they would see accomplished a great deal for the improvement of the condition of the people.

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he desired to make a few observations on behalf of those hon. Members with whom he was associated. He expressed his sincere gratification that the Speech from the Throne foreshadowed legislation which, if carried into effect, would be very helpful to those whom the Labour Members in a special sense represented. He was extremely pleased that a Bill with respect to workmen's compensation was to be brought forward. They were given to understand that the Government were going to amend the law in a manner which would make it efficacious in dealing with all cases of accident. In connection with this subject he desired to call attention to two matters: the question of out-workers, and the question of insurance. As to out-workers he represented in a special sense a body who were to a large extent outside the present law, and he wanted to put the case of those men before the House so that they might not by any possibility be overlooked in the framing of the Bill. There were many men engaged as out-workers in constructing machinery and on similar work. They had to perform their work under conditions which were infinitely more dangerous than those in the workshop, because they had to work with tools to which they were unaccustomed. They had to work often on unfinished floors, and in unfinished buildings. Under the present Act those men were debarred from compensation. Cases had been taken up to the highest Court at great expense to ascertain that fact. He hoped therefore, those men would be included in the new Bill. The question of insurance was even more important, because of more general application. He submitted that they needed insurance guaranteed by the Government for two reasons. As a Member of the Departmental Committee which dealt with this matter a year or two ago it was borne in upon him in a very forcible way that the insurance companies' agents were not altogether fair—as fair as they ought to be—and that in some cases they took an unfair advantage of the position they found themselves in in relation to the injured men. He and his hon. friends wanted to avoid that. He urged further that there should be a great extension of the Act to cover those who were employed in small workshops. He submitted that, in these cases the law would be inoperative unless at the same time some guarantee was given by the Government that the money was really there when wanted. There were many small employers with small capital, especially in the building trades, and when accidents occurred many of those men would plead that they had no money to pay compensation. Therefore in amending the present Act the law should be extended to cover the people in the employment of small employers. The principle of compulsory insurance should be applied to those small employers, The principle which was to be applied in connection with the repatriation of Chinese workers to their own country might very well be applied to our own kith and kin at home. The

Government should take some liability as they had, he understood, now done towards Chinese coolies. He rose, however, chiefly for the purpose of speaking on the subject of old age pensions. He submitted that the question was ripe and more than ripe for treatment. No question stirred the imagination of an audience in any part of the country more than this. From what he had heard to-day and yesterday he ventured to say that no other question excited so much interest in the minds of politicians on both sides of the House. It had been mentioned incidentally by more than half the speakers who had addressed the House. The question was ripe for treatment, because promises with regard to it had been made by politicians so long as he could remember, and hopes had been excited in the minds of the poor and aged from one end of the country to the other. It had been said that they were not promises but proposals. However that might be, he knew that hopes had been raised in hundreds of thousands of their poorer fellow citizens that a scheme of old age pensions would be established. This question was getting more important as years rolled on. Twenty years ago it was a matter of pride on the part of an employer, or, at all events, a reputable employer, that he would not discharge his old workmen. He did not know whether it was the result of competition or otherwise, but it was a fact that they did not now find the same degree of latitude allowed to old men as in former times. They did not find the same humane feeling between employer and employed as there was twenty or thirty years ago, On the contrary, when a workman's natural vigour was abated, his hair turned grey, and his back a little bent, he found it exceedingly difficult to get employment, and he was thrown out at an earlier age than before. They had heard a great deal here and elsewhere of the growth of imports and exports and of the increasing wealth of the country, but to the minds of himself and his hon. friends these matters were of little avail. They had heard a great deal also of their educational advantages. He agreed that education was better than it was formerly, but what was that to them so long as those educational advantages meant the sharpening of the wits and the intensification of the workshop-life of their fellow citizens? There were two courses open to the industrial veteran. He must either throw himself on the bounty of his friends and relatives or on Bumbledom. He submitted that the aged workman should not be thrown upon either. Having done his duty in his day and generation, maintained himself and his wife and family, and added to the wealth of the community, that community owed a duty to that man and ought at least to hold out a helping hand to him in old age. From a Return moved for by the hon. Member for Morpeth he found that in the year before last there were no less than 490,513 paupers over the age of sixty years. That was in England and Wales alone. On going back to the Commission of ten years ago, which, although somewhat out of date, covered the ground in a more complete form, he found that there were 1,980,000 people over the age of sixty-five. Probably they might take it that there were now about 2,000,000 in round figures over the age of sixty-five. That Commission reported that no less than 20 per cent. of that vast number were paupers at any one time, and 30 per cent. paupers at some time in the course of the year. They found that something like 400,000 of our fellow citizens over the age of sixty-five were paupers, and that 600,000 of them were paupers at one time or another in the course of the year. That was a symptom. It did not by any means plumb the depths of poverty, because there were many thousands of men and women in the country who would rather suffer want, who would rather starve or die than appeal to the workhouse official in any shape or form. It was therefore safe to say that these 600,000 were merely symptoms of poverty and that there were to-day something like a million men and women who had done their part in the daily struggle of life, but who were without the actual necessaries of life. Pensions were wanted for these people as a civic right. It was said by some that these people were themselves to blame; that they should have saved in their time of vigour. That was not so. A good deal might be said for the fact that they never had the chance of saving. But even if otherwise, he should still appeal to the House to act on the principle given by Hamlet who told Polonius to serve the players according to his own honour. He asked the House to remember that, and, even if it were true that some of these people had had the opportunity of saving and had not availed themselves of it, the House should not treat them in a narrow sense "but according to its own honour." But he would go further and say that these people had not had the chance of saving. The wages of many of the working people were only sufficient to cover the cost of the bare necessities of existence and not sufficient to cover the decencies and comforts of civilised life. He had read a correspondence in the newspapers initiated by a gentlemen who was now a Member of this House in which it was stated that the wages of the workpeople in a particular part of the country came out on the average at 14s. per week, while other writers who followed in the discussion put the wages of agricultural labourers at only 10s. or 11s. per week. Then they were told by Mr. Charles Booth that as the result of careful inquiry he found that one-third of the population in this country were living on wages of not more than £1 a week. He submitted that, in view of these facts, these people had no opportunity of saving for old age. Then, it was said that voluntary associations ought to have done something to solve this question. They had done something. They had dealt with this matter in a brotherly spirit. Speaking of trade unions, he could say that there were 12,000 or 14,000 members on their books receiving assistance, and even a larger number were on the books of the friendly societies of this country. But that was an insignificant proportion of the number of the people for whom he pleaded. Those who were members of trade unions and friendly societies after all had been in receipt of a wage which left a little margin for saving, whereas the people to whom he had referred, and for whom he pleaded, had wages so miserably inadequate that they had no margin for saving. A great deal had been said about the cost of old-age pensions. The hon. Member for Central Sheffield ventured to suggest that the cost might be met by a tax on imported manufactured goods. There was no need for anything of the sort; moreover, it would not meet the object the hon. Gentleman had in view. There were other sources of revenue which it would be far more statesman-like to tap, and which he hoped would be tapped. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham suggested that in order to meet the cost of old-age pensions the basis of taxation should be widened. He agreed, and with modesty he would suggest a means of getting the cost of these old-age pensions. Ten years ago the assessable income of this country amounted to £673,711,988, and the year before last it had arisen to the enormous total of £879,338,546, or an increase of about 30 per cent. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and those with whom the right hon. Gentleman associated, that they might help the Government to meet the cost of old age pensions by tapping that enormous source of revenue; and that might be done by a graduated income-tax which would reach those people in receipt of enormous incomes—the greater part of which incomes were derived from social wealth, and therefore ought to be diverted to social purposes. But apart altogether from the source from which the cost of old age pensions should be drawn, this rich country ought to provide the means to make the old age of the workers more tolerable. He refused to believe that this, the richest country on the face of the earth, which had spent £250,000,000 in suppressing two small republics, was not in a position to wipe out this stain on its escutcheon. He appealed to the supporters of the Government to give a strong lead in this matter as soon as that could possibly be done. The difficulty that the Government were in was recognised. The Labour Members recognised the mess that the Government had fallen heirs to; but they thought that one of the first things which ought to be attended to was this question of pensions to the aged poor. Knowing the feeling of the country on this matter, and having seen for himself that no question had more fired the imagination of the audiences he had addressed, he felt sure that the House would be acting in the best interests of those in the seat of authority if they dealt with this matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. A. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that he had listened with the utmost delight and with feelings of gratitude to the programme which His Majesty's Ministers had set forth in the gracious Speech from the Throne. He believed that that Speech would be received with gratitude by thousands of the poor people in the country districts. He was not at all astonished at the number of hon. Members who had spoken on the Chinese question. They on that side of the House were desperately in earnest on this question, and they meant what they said thoroughly. He made a study of the Ordinance on Chinese labour when it came out, and he did not know anything more disgraceful than some of its provisions, such as that which make it a criminal offence to give food or drink to a Chinaman who had left a compound, or to give him work. He had addressed many a meeting, and said that these Chinamen had been brought to South Africa for the purpose of excluding 20,000 white men from work. The evil had been done; the Chinamen were there, and the question was what was the best way of dealing with them. He had always spoken of the Chinese nation with the utmost possible respect. He believed the Chinese people to be second to no other nation in the world, and they ought not to be treated as slaves. Hon. Gentlemen opposite said that they were not slaves, but their ideas of freedom must be different from those of the Party to which he belonged. The Chinese in the Transvaal were in a condition of slavery. They could not strike for higher wages, or erect houses, or cultivate gardens, or take part in any enterprise which would make living cheaper. If the Chinese were set free they would strike for higher wages and then we should have 20,000 Englishmen working in the mines. Then Government inspection would be demanded, and it would be seen that the mines were put in a sanitary condition.

*MR. ROBERT DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that he wished to say a few words in support of what had already been said in condemnation of the Speech from the Throne not dealing more decidedly with the question of imports and exports. It had been very properly pointed out by some speakers on the Opposition side of the House that many of them were not protectionists, but were really free traders inasmuch as they desired freedom of trade. He would desire to associate himself with those who considered that they were the apostles of free trade, because they desired greater freedom of imports and exports. It was not really freedom of trade that they had now in freedom of imports. They had also to get freedom of exports. Were they to admit that it was impossible to do anything for the greater freedom of trade in the world of commerce? He was one of those who had been brought up in the belief that freedom of trade was a desirable thing, not only for trade itself, but as promoting more friendly intercourse between the great nations of the world, which of itself would be an advantage. He thought that many of those who held that view did not desire to build up tariff walls, nor to put themselves in the position of those exclusive nations who put 70 to 130 per cent. on imports, and thus closed the gates of commerce to mankind. They had a different ideal before them. They desired greater freedom of trade, and an increase in international intercourse. If they succeeded in doing something actively to promote greater freedom of trade, it was not right that they should be accused by the Ministerialists of being protectionists.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said the Hon. Member for Central Sheffield had contended that the election at which he was successful had, so far as he was concerned, been fought entirely upon the lines of fiscal protection, and had declared that that election was typical of the real opinion of the people of the country. In his (the hon. Member's) constituency the issue was also confined to that point, and the majority instead of being, as before the last election, 1,200 was at that contest 5,000. So far as that election was concerned it was an answer by the inhabitants of a great industrial centre to the proposal that foreign goods should be excluded from this country. They understood that in the words of the hon. Member for Central Sheffield the exclusion of foreign goods from this country by taxation must be reciprocal, and that if we were to take measures of fiscal reform to exclude from our industrial centres competition by goods manufactured in foreign centres they would take similar measures to exclude our goods. Of course they did that at present, and we did it by excess of manufacturing, and even to a certain extent by tariffs. The hon. Gentleman mentioned the case of the new tariff in Germany, but he could not have picked out a more unfortunate example, because the President of the Board of Trade only a week or two ago issued a circular in which he pointed out that every advantage which foreign countries were going to obtain by that new arrangment would also be obtained by us. That meant that, while foreign countries obtained an advantage by crippling their own industries and putting up prices to their own citizens of the necessary articles of consumption, we got all the advantage without any restrictions on our trade or our people. A memorable statement was made by the Emperor of Germany not long ago to the effect that Germany had grown great by hunger. That might be so, but one thing was certain that while the Hohenzollern family had shared the greatness it was by no means certain that they had shared the hunger. We did not want our Empire to be involved in the by-paths of famine in order to satisfy the ambition of certain right hon. Gentlemen opposite. [Laughter.] It might be a matter of laughter to hon. Gentlemen opposite, but it was the poorest of the poor who would first feel the pinch of any tax upon food. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and another right hon. Gentleman had been engaged upon a missionary enterprise, and had undertaken to convert 40,000,000 of people to the doctrine of sacrifice. He thought they had failed. Let them transfer their energies to the Colonies, and try to get the 12,000,000 of people there to adhere to the same doctrine. They should welcome them if they came back with a Zollverein, but not if they returned with a tariff for the restriction of trade. It had been suggested that the discussion on the King's Speech should not take a long time and he had compressed his remarks. He might remark, however, that the stifling of discussion in that House had in times past led to disasters to the Government and destroyed Parties. The free and uncurtailed expression of opinion in this House would, in his opinion, add to the strength and unity, not only of the Government but of the Party, and would enable them to give an unswerving devotion to the Leader of the House and the Government acting under his direction. They would be most untrue to their election pledges if they did not give every assistance in their power to the Government, and he believed they could do that best by using the plainest and the shortest language possible in this House.

*Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he would only detain the House a few moments for the purpose of thanking the Prime Minister for admitting the need for a proper Amendment of the Crofters Act. The crofters of the highland and islands of Scotland suffered very greatly. He had seen a great deal of the British Empire, and there was no part of it where the people suffered so much and whose misery was so great as that of the crofters of the highlands and islands of Scotland. For ten years he had asked a Tory Government to do something for these people and no one now in the House who was a Member of the last Parliament knew that better than the Leader of the Opposition. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham eighteen years ago visited the most congested part of the highlands of Scotland, and he had been appealed to time after time to put in a word for them, but in vain, though the right hon. Gentleman was not above sending down to the constituency which he (the speaker) had represented for the last fourteen years and appealing to the crofters to support the tariff reform candidate. The right hon. Gentleman, beaten in the cities and the great manufacturing centres, went whining to the crofters to support his protectionist policy. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister realised the importance of doing something for the highlands. There was no special promise of any Bill being introduced, but he sincerely trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not allow the session to go by without taking some action, and he appealed to him to lose no time in dealing with this question of such urgent and vital importance. He noticed that the other day the crofters took forcible possession of the Island of Vatersay, near Barra. He was not surprised. He, of course, deplored the breaking of the law, but what were men to do when they could get no satisfaction from highland landlords and when every day they saw the deer forests increasing. There were no people in His Majesty's dominions who were so badly off as the cottar and crofter population in the highlands and islands of Scotland, and while he sincerely thanked the right hon. Gentleman on their behalf for referring to this subject he again expressed the hope that no time would be lost, but that every effort would be made to push matters forward and deal with this urgent and vital question.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said he had listened to many speeches in this House but never to one which had given so much satisfaction to the Liberal side of the House and which had elicited so little hostile criticism from hon. Gentlemen opposite as that made yesterday by his right hon. friend the Prime Minister. He rejoiced in the tone of the speech and would only make reference to one thing that was not expected, but which, for that reason, was the more pleasing. He referred to the suggestion for abolishing plural voting in the constituencies. He hoped they would also abolish plural constituencies, that was to say, university constituencies. The last general election was fought on two great questions—free trade was one, and the other the condemnation of the South African policy of the late Government during the last ten years. He was convinced it was as much that feeling of condemnation as anything else which gave the Liberal Party the enormous majority they had. He rejoiced to see that the Government were going to take steps to stop the importation of Chinese labour. That was essential. Of course it was said that they ought to allow colonial feeling to decide this matter, but when this country had spent £250,000,000 and sacrificed 22,000 British lives in South Africa in giving British control over the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony he thought they had some right to say not only what the Government was to be, but in what way it was to be conducted. We had interfered and had claimed the right to interfere in the matter of servile labour when the Transvaal was a South African Republic, and if we interfered in the internal government of an independent State in which we had no right to interfere then we also had a right to interfere in the government of a colony of Great Britain over which the King had a constitutional right of veto. Further than that, he contended that if we conceded the right to the colony to decide freely and absolutely on the question of Chinese labour we ought to put the colony into the position in which it should be to decide such a question. It ought not to be fettered by the presence of 50,000 Chinese labourers in its midst. Their decision should be an unfettered decision, it could not be that under the present conditions. We should repatriate the Chinese and then give the colony the right to say what it would do. With regard to the new constitution to be granted to the Transvaal he thought it should be on the basis of population and not on the basis of a gerrymandering mining representation. The idea of representation on the basis of voters was altogether artificial. At most the voters were trustees for the population. Votes were not given to a limited number of the population for their own benefit; they were given to them as trustees for the entire population, and it was absurd to say we could accept the representation of a number of trustees and not the population for which they were trustees. Whenever the question of redistribution in this country had been discussed it had been discussed on the basis of population, and that should be the basis fixed for the Transvaal. It was said the conditions of the Transvaal were exceptional, because many of the voters were young men with no families, that these were the producers of the wealth of the country and would finally return to this country. That was a fallacious argument. The wealth of the

Transvaal had been there since the creation of the world and was not produced by these men at all. They no doubt took it from the ground, but that was a privilege accorded to them and not a right to give them any special ground to dominate the legislation of that country. The fact that they intended to return to this country should itself be a bar to trusting them with the permanent government of the Transvaal. Let them do as the Boers had done before them. Let them marry, settle down, and have families, and then the basis of population would be as favourable to them as to the Dutch inhabitants. He trusted that the Government would make a firm stand against the mineowners of South Africa, and show that the threats which were trotted out did not affect this country in the least. He was one who considered that the connection between any colony and the Imperial Government was one that was far more beneficial to the colony than it was to Great Britain. The South African mineowner had regarded himself very much in the same way as some youth with a fond mother, who, if he wanted more money, would threaten to cut the painter, or enlist in the army, and then the fond mother gave him what he wanted. That was exactly the position of the South African mineowners. They thought this country would be so afraid of their threat to cut the painter that we should climb down. It was for the Government, however, to show that the painter was more important to them than to us, and that we could cut it, but they could not, and that if they intended to put their policies upon us the danger of cutting the painter would arise from this side and not South Africa. It was a piece of idle bluff which had had its effect on the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, but would have no effect upon the enormous majority which this country had sent to the House of Commons, and which majority was not going to be dictated to in the manner he has stated.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) believed the whole House would agree with the speech made by the hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division of Glasgow with reference to the question of old age pensions so far as he expressed the feeling that something should be done in this direction. At the same time, having had some knowledge of the question from the point of view of the amount of money required, he would like to put before the House in a few words the matter as it appeared to him. He understood the Labour Party required that every man and woman at the age of sixty should receive 10s. per week, which would mean £26 a year. He did not know the exact number of people in this country who were over sixty years of age, but he supposed there would be about 5,000,000, and that would mean an expenditure of £130,000,000 sterling a year. That amount capitalised would be £2,000,000,000 or more. He sincerely trusted that some means might be found, but he did not think that it could be found in the way in which the hon. Gentleman suggested. In reference to the speech from the hon. Member for East Bristol, who dealt with the question of protection as it affected the city he represented, he would like to point out that the two industries at Bristol which were most important and most prosperous were those which were protected to some extent. He referred to tobacco and cocoa. The hon. Member for Northampton in his brilliant speech the previous night laid great stress upon the question of the taxation of food. Perhaps the House would be surprised to know that the amount of revenue derived in the last twenty years from taxes on food and drink, Excise and Customs, was over £800,000,000. The amount of taxation on food for thirty-two years ending 1886 was: from tea, £131,000,000; coffee, £110,000,000; sugar, £112,000,000; dried figs, £7,000,000; and from tobacco, £222,000,000. It would be only fair at election times, when talking about the taxation of food, to state that the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had not been to increase the tax on food, but to transfer the tax from one thing to another. The chief opponent of Mr. Chamberlain was Lord Goschen, who had said that the great scheme put forward in this country might increase the cost of living by one penny per family per week. That was to say that probably there would be no increase at all. At any rate it would be easy to alter the present system without increasing the cost of living, and he sincerely trusted the day would come to pass when an alteration would be made. With regard to the question of Chinese labour, he might mention that he had received a letter from a gentleman who had been a Member of this House and had been out in the compounds and understood the question. His correspondent told him that he considered the Chinese in South Africa were too well done by, and that the compounds were conducted in the same way as those of the Kaffirs. In these compounds there were electric light, hot and cold water supply, reading and recreation rooms. Was it fair to term that slavery? He had received many congratulations in regard to his election for a North of England constituency, and he assured the House that he won upon Chinese labour. Fortunately for him a man came forward who said he had been to South Africa, and who was willing to state that these men were living in a state of slavery. He was able to show a letter that the same man had offered his services to the Party opposite as well. There were many men on the Liberal side who did not take advantage of this cry, and refrained from putting forward those Chinese labour placards, and he honoured them for it; but in other constituencies they were used and no doubt they contributed to the great majority which they saw in the House of Commons at the present time. He trusted that in the near future some decision would be come to in regard to this matter, so that they might only have to deal with solid and not unfair arguments.

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said that none of them would begrudge the hon. Member opposite the pride which he felt in winning a seat in the North of England because there were so few of them now represented by Conservatives. With regard to the hon. Member's remarks about the taxation of food, he wished to point out to the House that in the last complete financial year the amount of taxation upon food was £15,000,000, and £10,000,000 of that was due entirely to the added taxation of the late Government. Therefore two-thirds of the taxation was due to the extravagance and incompetence of the late Government, and he had every confidence that the present Government would reduce taxation without putting a tax upon corn. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham appeared anxious because there was no reference to temperance legislation in the King's Speech, and *The Times* newspaper had expressed views very much in the same direction. He did not for one moment doubt the anxiety and the interest of the right hon. Gentleman in temperance legislation, but his concern for it at this particular moment was rather suspicious, and his own opinion was that the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to create a little rift in the ranks of the Ministerialists. They were not, however, quite so simple as to be caught with chaff of that kind, for they recognised that the Government could not do everything at once. He remembered a distinguished representative for Birmingham, Mr. Bright, once warned the Radicals that they could not drive six omnibuses abreast through Temple Bar. Those sitting with the Ministerialists were not unreasonable, for they had every confidence in the Government and were prepared to give them time. They recognised that this question was a difficult one, but hon. Members appeared to want everything dealt with at once. If they did that, it would leave them nothing to do next session. They were all fully convinced of the vital importance of the temperance question and the necessity for dealing with it. Their opposition to the Bill of 1904 was genuine, and he considered that the result of the working of the Licensing Act had confirmed that opposition. It was a bad Bill, and they expected this Government to deal with the whole question in the near future in a very substantial manner. Many of them were still of the opinion that temperance reform lay at the root of all social reforms and that it was long overdue. Consequently they looked to the Government in the next session of

Parliament to give them a comprehensive measure of temperance reform. They had every confidence in the Government, and they were not going to be lead away or induced to create differences and trouble, because they honestly believed that the pledges which had been given by the Government would be redeemed.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said the Liberal Party might congratulate themselves on being now in power, but the whole country also might be congratulated on having a Government that, unlike the late Government, did represent the people. He entirely agreed with the strictures which had been passed upon Chinese slavery in South Africa. Nothing, to his mind, could be worse than for any Government to allow slavery of this kind to be introduced in any part of the British Empire, and we thought it had been got rid of many years ago. He protested against the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, in which he contended that a colony had a right to adopt this sort of slavery if they chose. No colony had a right to introduce slavery of any sort whatever, and he trusted that hon. Members of this House as well as the Government would in due course make that quite clear. There was no doubt from what occurred at the general election that the people were in earnest when they said they would have no more slavery and that what John Wesley called "the sum of all villainies" should not be introduced again into any part of this country. There could be no question at all that the Chinese labour in South Africa was slavery of the very worst sort. Chinese slavery was introduced into the Transvaal for the purpose of making money and nothing else.

He was glad that the Government intended to deal with the question of education. He had heard an hon. Gentleman accuse the Government of desiring to introduce a new religion into this country. He could not agree with him. He understood that the Government intended to introduce the Bible into the schools and not dogma made up to suit the Tory Party at elections.

He was obliged to the Prime Minister for mentioning the question of the crofters in the King's Speech. What they would want to know presently was how soon was he going to do anything for those people. The Lord Advocate, in a speech made a week ago, stated that Scotland must wait, and he had added that that was because they had not suffered so much as other people. He hoped the Lord Advocate was not speaking for the Government, because it was not a wise thing to tell the people of Scotland they must wait, although they were the most orderly in any part of the United Kingdom. (Laughter.) Hon. Members might laugh at that, but he supposed it was because they did not know the country. It might surprise some Members to know that in Sutherland there were only eighteen policemen, including the chief constable. On the day of the late election the chief constable was away in Skye voting, he thought, for the Tory candidate. There were sixteen constables employed at the election in Sutherland, leaving only one policeman to look after the whole county, and it was looked after very well. Those who knew the county thought they could do with even fewer policemen than they had now. The great question in the crofting counties was the land question. In Sutherland they had been waiting nearly 100 years to have this settled. In 1886 the Liberal Party did a great deal for them in passing the Crofters Act, but that was not all that was wanted, because it did not give them possession of the land they required. There was no question of confiscation, for the crofters were willing to pay a fair price or rent for the land. In 1892–3 a Royal Commission was appointed to ascertain whether in the six crofting counties there was land that could be made available for the extension of crofts, etc. After a careful survey it was found that in these counties there were 1,783,785 acres which might be used for the extension of present crofts, new crofts or small holdings. The Commission did not overdo it. Some people said that they had left out a million acres which might have been included. In Sutherland there were 395,898 acres that might be so used. The result of the Commission ought to be carried out, so that the crofters and others might have a chance of living. He found that in the six counties 409,472 acres had been taken away from the people and converted into deer forests, and in Sutherland alone 36,628 acres had been taken for sporting purposes between the years 1898–1904. He, therefore, appealed to the Prime Minister to put a stop as speedily as possible to the system of turning the land from agricultural purposes into deer forests. Last autumn a case came under his notice in Sutherlandshire where 1,000 acres of farming land were about to be formed into a deer forest for the sport of somebody, perhaps in the West-end of London or of some manufacturer in Birmingham. About 300 acres were arable land, and there were three small farms. They were actually about to pull down the three houses and turn this farming land into a deer forest.

The land was taken away from the people, and although they wanted it back again they were willing to pay a fair price or fair rent for it. Some effort should be made to keep the people in their own country, and allow them to bring up their families in decency and comfort. These people in the Highlands were perfectly orderly and law-abiding, and he trusted that that would not be used against them. He hoped that the right hon. the Prime Minister would carry out his own statement, viz., that we should colonise our own country. That was exactly what he wanted to do in regard to the crofting counties in the north. These counties could produce cattle, sheep, and many other agricultural products. It was a curious thing that some of those gentlemen who belonged to the Tariff Reform Association refused to allow our own people to have the land on which they could raise cattle and sheep, and so drove us to foreign countries for a supply of meat. We spent £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 a year abroad for food which might easily be produced in this country were the people allowed access to the land. Again, what was wanted in Sutherland was proper postal service. When the people of that county asked the late Government for such a service they were told that it would not pay; but the very idea of a penny postal system was that the more densely populated districts of the country should pay for the scattered ones, and therefore it was no answer to say to those who wanted a better postal service that it would not pay. Further, they wanted a better telegraph service. There were some places in Sutherlandshire which were twenty or thirty miles distant from the nearest telegraph office, and in case of sickness the people had to walk or drive that long way before they could summon a doctor. He trusted that the present Government would do something to alleviate these difficulties. There was no reason why they should not assist in establishing a proper steamboat service all round the North and West coasts of Sutherland. If millions of money could be spent on useless railways in Africa, surely a few hundred thousand pounds might be spent in colonising and developing our own country. There was the fishing industry, for instance, which was sadly injured by trawlers. He hoped that the Government would do everything in their power to enable the fishermen in the North to get their harvest of the sea to market. He spoke not in the interests of a class, but of the masses of the people; and he hoped that the present Government and Parliament would be able to do more in the next few years for the benefit of the people of our own country than had ever been done before.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) said that he could not follow the hon. Gentleman opposite on the question of the crofters, but he could speak from personal knowledge on the subject of Chinese labour in South Africa. It had been stated that the condition of the Chinese labourers in South Africa was that of slavery; and when an hon. Member had suggested that these Chinese labourers enjoyed their swimming bath and other provisions for their comfort, there was laughter. He himself had been in the Chinese compounds, and had seen these slaves swimming in their baths, playing fan-tan, and games of ball; and he had also seen them cared for in the hospitals. So far as he could understand, the conditions under which the Chinese labourers lived in the compounds were much the same as would be applied to soldiers, sailors, undergraduates of universities—[MINISTERIAL ironical laughter]—and all other bodies of men whom it was necessary to keep under proper discipline. The Chinese labourers were not allowed to remain in the country and become landowners, but that was no exceptional regulation, for in most countries there were restrictions upon aliens buying land. He believed that every country in the world reserved its right to say whether it would allow aliens to purchase land or not. Although in England we did allow them to do so, there were many other countries where they could not hold land under any conditions. As to the economic question, it had been argued that the Chinese ought to be sent back, but looking at the matter from a business point of view, it was for the Transvaal to decide finally on that point. Suppose the new Government should decide upon the point that this labour was permissible, then they would have to be sent back again to South Africa. This would not be business or economy and would involve a large expenditure of money. What would happen would be that 4,000 white men, chiefly Englishmen, would be at once thrown out of employment, and the large amount which they were paid for salaries would be lost. Some 200,000 or 300,000 shareholders who resided in England held shares in these mines. Their holdings were small, but surely they were deserving of some consideration. These shareholders would be hit if any precipitate action was taken or any radical alteration made.

*MR. W. H. LEVER (Cheshire, Wirral) expressed his sympathy with the views put forward by the hon. Member for the Blackfriars division of Glasgow on the subject of old age pensions. He was sure it was quite beyond the reach of the workers themselves to provide sufficient for their old age. He was equally certain that the question could not be dealt with by individual employers. With regard to the education of the children, the State had recognised the duty of doing something for those members of the community who were not in a position to do it for themselves. The provision of free education for the children was provision for citizens at the beginning of life. Provision of old age pensions was provision for citizens at the end of their lives. He submitted that the principle in each case was identical, and that just as those scholars who in their youth received free education had to pay it back to the State while they were in the prime of life in the form of contributions to the taxation of the country, so those who received old age pensions would during the active period of their lives contribute to the State in taxation the funds from which the pension was drawn. With regard to the means of providing the money, he suggested that in addition to a graduated income tax, of which he cordially approved, they would probably be able to make some economies in existing expenditure. It might be useful to resolve that before any remission of taxation took place, before the present income-tax was reduced, they should consider who had the best claim on the funds at the disposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If they considered that question they would, he was sure, be all agreed that those who for a great number of years had had the promise of old age pensions dangled before them by both parties had a first claim upon whatever surplus the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have. The question of old age pensions might be approached in the same spirit as Parliament approached the question of free education. Thirty-five years ago when the first instalment of free education was given they did not think it necessary to wait until they could provide for the entire freeing of education. They could approach old age pensions in the same spirit. If they had not the money available to provide pensions at the age of sixty-five, which in his opinion was the proper age, let them commence the pensions at seventy; and if not at seventy then at seventy-five [Oh!"] But let them resolve that these were to be only stepping stones to the full and complete scheme of old age pensions for each man and woman on attaining the age of sixty-five.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said the tenor of the speeches on the Opposition side of the House, both on the previous evening and this afternoon, went to prove that the election which had recently taken place had been decided on nothing less than false pretences. The great majority of Members on the Ministerial side of the House had been accused of endeavouring to catch votes by grossly misrepresenting the state of affairs in relation to Chinese labour in the Transvaal, either by means of posters or by other means described as unfair. Those Members who had the honour of being in the last Parliament must know that at the time this Ordinance was first proposed by the late Colonial Secretary, Members on the Ministerial side of the House gave it their undying hostility in every possible way the constitution of this House would allow. They pointed out to the then Government what necessarily would take place if this abominable system of labour was introduced into the Transvaal; they showed that these poor Chinese were, in many thousands of cases, the victims of secret societies in China, and that they would be sent to the Transvaal like so many sheep or cattle, not knowing, in the slightest degree, under what conditions they were to serve. He did not blame the agents or the mining companies for that, because the state of affairs in China was such that it would be absolutely impossible for any accredited agent of the Government or mining company to explain the terms of their employment to these people, owing to the difficulties of dialect, which made it more difficult for a Chinaman of the north of China to understand one from the south, than it was for us to understand a Frenchman or a German. He did not doubt that the disaster from which they had suffered was largely due to the uncompromising and unprecedented way in which the Conservative Party had forced that unjust and unrighteous measure through the House. He did not think there had been any speech delivered during the recent election which was not entirely in consonance with the speeches that had been delivered in the House by the hon. Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool, and other hon. Members during the course of this debate. He thought they would be doing scant justice to their cause if they had not presented these matters as fully as they could to their constituents. Much had been said about posters. The one leaflet which he had prepared himself, which was simply a hand bill, came from a Conservative newspaper of enormous circulation in London and elsewhere, and it pointed out the terrible state of affairs on the Rand owing to the introduction of Chinese labour, or whatever they chose to call it. He thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham might have employed the time at his disposal rather better than he had done in trying to show that the Liberal Government and the Leader of the House that they had got into a difficult position through having denounced this iniquitous and unrighteous system of slavery and by not having, directly they came into office, annulled the Ordinance allowing these people to enter the Transvaal. He thought the Government had acted exceedingly wisely in prohibiting the issue of licences for the importation of more Chinese. The Leader of the House had only been a few days in office when he was met by the fact that the late Administration had signed permits for 16,000 Chinamen to come into the colony. No explanation had been given by right hon. Gentlemen opposite of that circumstance, which was a most significant thing.

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

MR. CATHCART WASON (continuing his speech), said that hon. Members would recollect that last night the Prime Minister expressed in very felicitous terms the hope that they had enjoyed a very pleasant hour of relaxation. He sincerely trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would remember, when the business of the House came under the consideration of his Government, that business was expedited, and the health, not only of the Members but of the numerous staff, was greatly benefited by the short period of relaxation. Returning to this miserable Chinese labour question, he confessed it was a matter of surprise to him that hon. Members opposite had still found it in their hearts to brazen the matter out. The hon. Member for West Birmingham put a number of questions to the Prime Minister, and he should have liked now to put a few to him, if the right hon. Gentleman had been in his place. After his trip to South Africa a meeting of a great gold mining company was held in London, and the chairman then stated that the mining companies had done their part and it now remained for the Government to do theirs, and very shortly after the Government introduced their scandalous proposal for the introduction of Chinese labour. The hon. Member had said he was not responsible. Who was if not himself? Then after the Prime Minister had very wisely forbidden the importation of further batches of Chinese labour, there was an immediate outcry among the mining companies and the journals they control, one of them stating amongst other terms of reproach that the action of the Prime Minister had falsified the pledges of the hon. Member for West Birmingham. Surely that looked as if he was responsible for the whole matter, and his action in leaving his office and leaving his work to Mr. Lyttelton very largely went to show his responsibility and culpability. The right hon. Member throughout by his questions and speech, thought he had placed the Prime Minister in a difficulty, in a cleft stick, just as Mr. Balfour thought he had placed the Liberal Party in a difficulty by suddenly and unexpectedly resigning office at a time when he believed there was a serious difference of opinion among prominent members of the Liberal Party with reference to Irish affairs, and with just as poor a result. The action of Mr. Balfour only precipitated the downfall of the Conservative Party, and the speech of the Prime Minister had amply satisfied his Party, and would satisfy the country. We were to have no more Chinese coolies imported until full self-government was granted to the Colonies, and even then we would not be content to allow them to do just as they pleased in the matter, and the Government would not sanction the introduction of Chinese labour on such terms as had been imposed under the late Government. The right hon. Member for Croydon saw no difference between the proposal of the Government that they would out of Imperial funds defray the passage home of any Chinese coolie who wished to return home for any reason, whether because he had been seduced to the mines under false pretences, or because of ill-treatment, insufficient wage, or any other reason, and the Ordinance of himself and his friends, under which a poor Chinaman, out of his shilling a day, might return at his own expense. At the time the Ordinance was under discussion it was repeatedly shown that this clause must be inoperative, as it would be impossible for the Chinamen ever to save sufficient for such a purpose. After all, we were only imposing on the Colonies and the mine owners the same restrictions that we placed on the Boers—"that no slavery or apprenticeship partaking of the nature of slavery should be allowed within the Transvaal territory," and he thought the matter could very well rest there.

He was glad to note such a favourable expression of opinion in favour of old age pensions, but he thought the hon. Member for the Wirral Division of Cheshire had not made a good suggestion in saying that the pensions, on account of financial difficulties, might be deferred until those in need attained a still greater age; in the words of an election ballad, the fact that "the pension will come when we're all of us dead," did not offer many attractions. Surely it would be far better to commence with such a sum as we could afford. Even a few shillings a week would make an enormous difference to many a one and save many a poor person from the workhouse and the lunatic asylum. The remarks of the hon. Member for Waterford, the Leader of the Irish Party, describing in touching and feeling terms the state of affairs in Ireland, might have been applied to Scotland, except that the position was much aggravated by the deer forests in Scotland. The hon. Member for Sutherlandshire had not in the least overstated the case against the deer forests, rather the contrary; in the last twenty years over a million of acres had been added for this senseless, cruel sport. He could understand sport if it meant the killing of wild animals that might endanger the lives of people, or he could understand sporting for the purpose of food, but to rear and protect unoffending animals for the purpose of killing them was compatible with neither civilisation nor Christianity, and its only purpose was to make a short holiday for a few wealthy persons who came with their motor drivers, for whom they had to find a French name, and flunkies of all sorts. Vast territories had been depopulated. Highlanders, who had done so much to make the Empire what it is, who had colonised the waste places of the earth, who had fought the Empire's battles by land and sea, saw their country a desert. Where once were many happy homes there was now nothing but the abomination of desolation. The policy of the Tory Party was well defined on this point by a distinguished Tariff Reformer—

> "Let us be real free traders. Let us get our mutton from New Zealand, our wool from Australia, and leave our Highland glens and straths for sport with the noblest animal on earth—the red deer."

All over England they saw the same thing on perhaps a more aggravated scale, where thousands of acres were given up to the breeding and rearing of harmless pheasants or rabbits for the purpose of being slaughtered. It was a short-sighted policy on the part of the landlords, because it was only population that gave value to land. In the early days of New Zealand settlement land was purchased, if not for an old song, for a bit of tobacco or a blanket; that land, owing to population, had now become of great value. In his own constituency the evil had been still greater within the memory of persons still living; hundreds of cruel evictions had taken place not even for the purpose of sport, but for the more sordid and contemptible purpose of getting a few extra shillings by turning the people's homes into big sheep and cattle farms.

His hon. friend the Member for Spen Valley was a notable temperance reformer, and had given the House wise advice. Personally, he put land reform far away before any other reform, but he was content to wait, feeling sure that the Government had the matter thoroughly at heart. He rejoiced that an important Crofters Bill occupied a portion of the King's Speech. It had long been wanted, and the Scottish people were looking forward to it with keen interest and anxiousness. He could not sit down, however, without reminding the Government of another very important and constantly increasing class in Scotland, viz., the cottars and fishermen, who had the greatest difficulty in getting a small piece of land for a home where they could do some work when not engaged at their usual occupations, where their wives and families could live in some degree of comfort. It was a disgrace to the country that such men could not obtain land except on the most extravagant and ruinous conditions. Close to the most important town in his constituency fishermen were forced to live under the most insanitary conditions, while there was any amount of land quite close, but unobtainable. The right hon. Member for East Fife, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, had given a distinct pledge that for the purpose of obtaining land for such men the Government would introduce legislation for the compulsory purchase of land. The Allotments Act in Scotland had been a dead letter. He trusted that when the Government had this matter under consideration they would not hand such powers over to the country parish authorities, who, for many reasons, were unfitted to deal with it, but endow the Congested Districts Board with ample powers and funds. He especially desired to bring under the attention of the Secretary for Scotland the sympathetic attitude of his predecessor towards the nursing question. Many districts and some islands with populations running to 400 men were quite without medical or nursing attendants of any sort. He was glad to note that the Member for Waterford made the demand last night for powers of compulsory purchase; he wished he had forced his views on the House when the Irish Land Purchase Bill was going through, there would be no difficulty then in dealing with the evicted tenants. The matter of land reform was of vital importance to the wellfare of the nation and as such should be dealt with at the earliest possible moment.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough) said he regretted troubling the House so early on the seamen's question, but he desired to ask the President of the Board of Trade a question with regard to the proposals of the Government to introduce two Shipping Bills He did not know the right hon. Gentleman's intentions, but he ventured to suggest to him that it would be desirable if the Government would follow the recommendations of the Committees appointed by their predecessors—the "Manning and Mercantile Marine Committees"—which Committees sat for over two years and received evidence from shipowners, seamen and captains, and after exhaustive inquiry recommended certain alterations in the Merchant Shipping Act with regard to the manner in which vessels should be manned. Seeing that the Manning Committee, on which shipowners sat, unanimously arrived at certain recommendations, he did hope the right hon. Gentleman would embody those recommendations in his Merchant Shipping Bill. With regard to the Mercantile Marine Committee, for over eight and a half years he had the privilege of speaking on behalf of the seamen in this country, and brought before the House many of their grievances, with the result that the Government appointed a Committee, presided over by the late Sir Francis Jeune, which after careful inquiry recommended that the food scale should be altered. Indeed the Committee drafted a food scale, and he endeavoured to persuade them that it should be made compulsory; but the shipowners on the Committee said that if the Committee did not recommend that the scale be made compulsory, they felt sure the shipowners would adopt the scheme. That was over four years ago, and he was very sorry to say there were not more than a hundred shipowners who had adopted the scale recommended by the Committee. That, he thought, went to prove that shipowners generally would not adopt the recommendations of any Committee unless there was some little compulsion; he therefore hoped the scale recommended by the Committee would be made compulsory by his right hon. friend. On previous occasions he had explained to the House the many hardships inflicted upon our merchant seamen, in consequence of the class of food that had been supplied in years gone by, and he was sorry to say in some instances was supplied to-day. With regard to certificates to cooks, of whose incompetence on merchant ships they had heard so much, the Committee recommended that all such cooks should pass a Board of Trade examination, for which certificates should be granted, and that no shipowner should be allowed to employ a a cook without that certificate. He trusted his right hon. friend would also embody that recommendation in the Bill. Then, with regard to inspection of seamen's food, for which, in 1891, the House passed a Bill. When the Bill left the House it was to apply to all merchant vessels, but he regretted that in another place Amendments were inserted with the result that it only applied to vessels employed in certain trades. The effect was that provisions that had been condemned on vessels bound for voyages through the Suez Canal round Cape Horn and the Cape of Good Hope were taken on vessels bound for ports in the Mediterranean and Black Seas. That was a very wrong thing. The Mercantile Marine Committee recommended an extension of the Act of 1891, and he hoped his right hon. friend would be able to see his way to embody that recommendation also. Then, with regard to certificates; seamen had very good reason to complain of the present form of continuous certificates of discharge. He did not know why sailors and firemen should be treated differently from any other class of working men. Another workman would consider it very hard to have to produce, before he could get employment, a book giving a record of his previous services. The main objection of seamen to these books was that the captain might at the end of a voyage decline to report, which was tantamount to an inferior discharge. Many instances had been brought to his notice in which men with five or six years good record, because they had some petty grievance with the captain or any of the officers, had had their books marked "decline to report," with the result that the men had difficulty in obtaining employment. Then he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would consider the question of making some alteration in these books. The seamen demanded that the character should be taken out of the book entirely, because it was no guarantee whatever. As a matter of fact he reported one instance to the Board of Trade two and a half years ago, in which three firemen went on shore in a port in Russia and were absent from the vessel for three days drunk, and the captain entered the offence in the official log, fining each man 15s. At the end of the voyage the captain made a bargain with the men, that if they would agree to that item being put into their account as cash received from him, he would give them a very good discharge, and of course the 15s. from each man went into the master's pocket. He only mentioned that case to show that the character generally entered in the men's book was no guarantee that they were good or bad men. Another important question deserved the attention of his right hon. friend. A good deal had been heard in the last three months regarding the employment of foreign seamen on British ships. From the national point of view it was a question of the greatest possible importance. Year by year the number of British seamen had been steadily declining and they had been largely supplanted by Lascars and Chinamen. The foreign grievance certainly was a bad one, but the British seamen had far more to complain of from the competition of the Lascar and the Chinaman than from the employment of the foreigner. Of course they were told that the Lascar was a British subject. He should never for one moment think of condemning any Lascar or even objecting to his employment; but he did say that neither Lascar nor Chinamen should be used for the purpose of displacing British seamen in their own country's vessels. We did not employ Lascars in the Navy, and no man would seriously suggest that Lascars should be employed on our war ships, yet if we went on year after year continually increasing the number of Lascars and Chinamen employed there would be no employment left for the Britisher, and then, if this country embarked in a great naval war it would be found that they had done a very wrong thing in allowing its maritime population to disappear entirely from British vessels. The Mercantile Marine Committee suggested the only true solution of the question. It was nonsense to talk about British ships limiting the number of foreign hands employed to percentages, because it would not work out in practice, but what we could and should do was to embody in a Merchant Shipping Bill a clause that no foreigner should be employed on a British ship unless he could speak and understand the English language. It was a disgrace that at the present time on a vessel of 1,600 tons, carrying twelve or fourteen men as sailors and firemen—probably twelve would be foreigners of eight or nine different nationalities, and not able to speak or understand a word of our language. He could not for the life of him understand why shipowners——

*MR. HOUSTON (Liverpool, West Toxteth): Do you suggest that I employ foreigners on my ships; for I do not.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON thought his hon. friend was a little too previous. He said he could not understand for the life of him why shipowners were so neglectful of their duty as to allow crews to be engaged at Continental ports composed of so many different nationalities and the majority of whom were not able to speak a word of the English language.

*MR. HOUSTON: You were looking at me, and directing your remarks to me.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON did not know that the hon. Gentleman was quite so nervous at his looks, but he assured him he did not intend any offence. He was applying his remarks generally to gentlemen interested in ships. He said it was a scandal, and considering that numbers of men had been sacrificed in consequence of the employment of men who were entirely ignorant of our language, he had justification for speaking a little strongly. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not confine the operation of the clause to ports in the United Kingdom, because where we were suffering most from this grievance was at Continental ports. Right hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side had said during the General Election that what was wanted was more work for the British working man. He had generally said less work and more pay. But if they were so anxious to provide work for the British working-man let him assure them that every year 40,000 men were discharged from British ships at Continental ports between the River Elbe and Brest, and 40,000 foreigners were taken on in their place. He should have thought that those who were interested in shipping and were strong tariff reformers would have looked into that question, because charity should begin at home, and a man should put his own house in order before attacking any one else. Those 40,000 foreigners spent the whole of their earnings on the Continent. At the port of Antwerp there were three men called shipping masters, each of whom made an income of over £6,000 a year in the way of blood-money extorted from the seamen, because those crimps had a kind of agreement with shipping people on this side that they should have the monopoly of supplying the men, and when a man went to seek employment on a British vessel in Antwerp, he was referred to a certain person and when he applied for a berth, he found he was unable to get it without paying a fee of from 10s. up to £1 for the privilege of having a job on a British ship. This had been going on for twenty years. That was why no British seaman or fireman could get employment, because he refused to pay this extortionate fee, and it largely accounted for the number of foreigners who got employment there on British ships and could not speak English, but were willing to pay this blood-money for the privilege of employment. He believed that could be stopped by applying that clause of the Bill to the Continent, providing that if crews were engaged at Continental ports they would have to comply with the law, and satisfy His Majesty's Consul as to their knowledge of the English language. He would suggest that a clause should be inserted in the Bill that a master, when engaging a crew abroad, should first try to obtain seamen who could speak our language; but if unable to do that, and he satisfied the Consul he had made every effort, then perhaps the master should be allowed to make the best arrangements he could under the circumstances. He believed that if his right hon. friend embodied in the Bill such a clause it would go a long way towards remedying a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. He wished to say a few words regarding the extension of the Workmen's Compensation Act to seamen. He did not know what might be the intentions of the Government, but he hoped there would be no mistake about giving justice to the poor unfortunate sailors and firemen, whom he wished to see included in the Workmen's Compensation Act and not dealt with by any special Act. For over twenty-six years he had pleaded hard for a simple act of justice to the sea-faring community. He did not understand why the seamen were left for so long outside the original Act. It was very remarkable that the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for West Birmingham had not insisted on seamen being included in the Compensation Act, because as far back as 1884 he introduced a Bill proposing to apply the Employers' Liability Act to seamen. He thought, therefore, he could rely on having the support of the right hon. Gentlemen.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has changed since then.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON said some of his hon. friends seemed to be sceptical on the point, but he wished to assure them that he had yet some confidence in the right hon. Gentleman, because he remembered one speech which the right hon. Gentleman delivered in 1884, in which he said he would never rest night or day until justice was done to the seamen. He, therefore, felt full of confidence and hope that having a Liberal Government in office and a good friend on the Conservative side of the House in the person of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham the tide was running strongly in favour of the seafaring men, and that they would get this act of justice which had been fought for for so long. The right hon. Gentleman pointed out years ago, as a reference to Hansard would show, that one seaman out of every sixty-six met with a violent death on board ship. No other trade or occupation in the country could equal that. There were hundreds of unfortunate seamen crippled and maimed for life. Seamen were a class of men who had no home or habitation, and when misfortune befell them the only place of refuge was the poor-house, and the ratepayers had to pay for their accommodation; whereas, shipowners avoided rates, except on their offices. Let it not be supposed, however, that shipowners were opposed to seamen having the benefits of the Compensation Act. He believed there were in the House nineteen hon. Gentlemen representing shipping, and at least twelve of them were in favour of the seamen having the benefits of the Compensation Act He appealed to his right hon. friend to extend the Act to seamen on the same basis as it was applied to other workmen. One or two little clauses might be necessary to meet the case of ships and seamen, but there was no great difficulty in the way, and he did trust some measure of hope would be held out to seamen that justice would be done to them; and he was sure they and their wives, children, and relatives would bless the Government.

*MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said he had been returned to the House of Commons by a London constituency with the largest majority in the metropolis to give an independent, and he trusted an intelligent, support to the Government. That mandate compelled him at this early stage to inquire how far the Government programme justified the hopes, expectations, and promises, upon the faith of which he, at least, was sent to Parliament. If the Government programme justified those hopes and expectations he recognised at once that his sole duty in this House was to be a loyal, dutiful, and orderly soldier in the Prime Minister's great army. If on the other hand it should appear to him that the programme fell short of those expectations, then he was confronted with the choice of two alternatives, one of which would be to tell his constituency that he had been deceived, and that he had innocently deceived them; and the other alternative would be to adopt the course of stepping in where angels feared to tread and endeavour to render a little practical assistance as a man of business and a man of affairs to His Majesty's Ministers, who appeared somewhat baffled at the problem of putting some of their promises into legislative shape. He felt compelled to adopt the latter attitude when he looked at the composition of the Ministry, and he hoped the two great legal luminaries to whom the financial trade interests of this country had been committed would not resent any assistance which the humblest supporter of the Government sitting in the remotest corner of the House was bold enough to offer. He wished to consider for a moment how far the promises made to his constituency were likely to be fulfilled. Much discussion had taken place as to the exact issues upon which the recent election had been decided. Speaking for himself, and on behalf of a constituency fairly representative of the other metropolitan constituencies, he wished to state that the first and foremost of those issues was that of Chinese labour in the Transvaal. Secondly, there was the question of educational reform, then pensions for the aged poor, the question of the unemployed, fiscal reform, and the future government of Ireland. He happened to be one of those hon. Members guilty of the bad taste of publishing some of the cartoons to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had referred. Little did he know at that time that instead of depicting Chinese serfs in chains with their hands tied behind them he ought to have painted them basking in the glory of the electric light and disporting themselves in the luxury of a Turkish bath, and, that instead of being confined in compounds, every Chinese coolie should have been depicted as possessing three acres and a cow. He had no hesitation in saying that the Chinese labour Ordinance in South Africa had brought about a condition of things there contrary in every respect to the spirit and constitution of the government of this country. They had been told that economically the Ordinance was a failure. They knew that politically it was dangerous, but was it necessary to remind the House that morally it was a pestilence? How many Chinese women were there? With all respect and humility he urged the Government to give some attention to this matter when considering other modifications. The Prime Minister had told them that he would cut a short route to the solution of this question by giving the right to every one of these Chinese coolies to go home if for any reason he was dissatisfied with his lot. If that were a genuine promise it seemed to him that there was little else to argue about, except the moral aspect of the question to which he had referred. As a practical man he wished to ask how was the Chinese serf to have this right communicated to him? It certainly should not be left to the mine managers, but it should be embodied in a notice drawn up in this country, in the Chinese language, with the approval of the Chinese Ambassador, and it should be exhibited in every part of the mine, and in every compound in which the Chinese were confined. That was the only practical way in which they could give effect to the promise of the Prime Minister. He gathered that the Government had decided not only to concede this right to the Chinaman to return to his own country if he desired so to do, and to modify the punitive conditions. but he understood that the Government had also determined to stop all further importation of Chinese workmen into South Africa. In addition to this they were about to send a Commission out to South Africa to inquire into the question of the future electoral basis of self-government for those Colonies. He was quite satisfied with those promises, and the sooner they reached finality in this matter, and ceased to unsettle everything connected with this industry, the better it would be for all concerned. With regard to education, he was horrified to hear an hon. Member reintroduce the sectarian religious element into this controversy. An hon. Member had said, that if the principles of the Liberal Party were to be enforced, it meant a new religion for their primary schools. If the Government did not boldly tackle this subject in the light that the State was the secular parent of the child there would be a great deal of discussion and opposition to whatever measure might be introduced. It was no part of the duty of the State to undertake the religious teaching of the child. Just in proportion as sectarian discussions were introduced so would they be undermining the educational system, and if they insisted upon giving religious teaching it should be out of school hours. There were a good many aspects of the education question, but there was no indication in the King's Speech of the lines upon which the proposed measure would proceed, and therefore they must possess their souls in peace. With reference to old-age pensions it would be sheer hypocrisy for any hon. Member to deny the expectations which had been aroused in the minds of the electors upon this subject. He was bitterly disappointed at the admission of the Government that, whilst their sympathies were with this scheme, they could not find the means of giving it practical effect. He could not help thinking that it would have been better before arousing the expectations to which he had referred if the means of carrying them into legislative form had been considered. The statesman or politician who said that there was not the means at hand to provide a very substantial solution of this problem was unworthy of the title. Reference had been made to a graduated income-tax, and it had been stated that the mere interest on the South African war loan would have gone a long way towards solving this problem. If the Government had not the means to carry such a measure into effect what would they do if war broke out again? Would they say that they could not afford to fight? No, for the first thing they would tell them would be that they had the ships, they had men, and they had the money too. Therefore, he saw no practical difficulty in finding every man of sixty-five years of age and upwards a substantial pension to alleviate his old age. Were there no other sources of taxation open to them? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was right in saying that the basis of taxation should be widened. Could they not obtain the opinion of the learned counsel who now represented the City of London as to whether there were any funds held by the City Guilds which belonged to the poor? Could they not tax the unearned increment for the benefit of the poor? Could they not tax racecourses and racehorses?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): And bookmakers.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: Yes, every bookmaker, every bachelor, and every motor car in the land and a thousand other things. There was some irony in the fact that they could coolly and deliberately go and spend £250,000,000 for the benefit of the English residents in the Transvaal and a mongrel crew of oriental and cosmopolitan financiers and plutocrats, and yet they were told that they could not find money for an old age pension scheme. When it was said that one of the principal promises on which the Liberal Party came into power was impossible of fulfilment because they had not the money, it naturally tempted men to cast a favourable eye on fiscal reform. If a Bill were introduced or a Resolution proposed by one of the Labour Members he would undertake that they would be able to indicate to the Chancellor of the Exchequer at least fifty ways in which he could obtain every penny required. The unemployed had also been a very important factor at the recent election. They had no indication of what the Government were going to do to improve the Unemployed Act. He looked in vain in the King's Speech for any reference to the promised appointment of the Royal Commission on canals to which a reference had been made. If a comprehensive system of reclaiming and reviving the waterways of England were undertaken, not only would they give employment to the unemployed for the next seven or ten years, but they would at the same time be assisting to solve the problem of cheap transport. With regard to fiscal reform, he did not hail with as much satisfaction as some hon. Members on that side the reference in the King's Speech to the present condition of exports and imports. The only real test of the prosperity of a country was the condition of its people. The Government would have done better not to trouble themselves about fallacious statistics of imports and exports, but to endeavour to look into the kernel of our social system and try to find a solution of the problem with which we were confronted. Whilst, in one sense, this was the richest country in the world, on the other hand, one-third of our population were living on the verge of starvation. If the right hon. Member for West Birmingham or any one else could hold out the slightest hope of a remedy for that state of things, instead of availing themselves of every opportunity of throwing obloquy upon the right hon. Gentleman, they would best be discharging their duty by examining any proposals which he or anybody else might propose. He trusted, however, that the Government would find some solution for the present social evils less calculated to disturb the industries of the world than the tariff proposals of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. With regard to the Irish question it was hypocrisy to pretend that they had not raised some idea that they had entered upon a new era in regard to this question. They were told that they were going to solve the Irish question by instalments. He came to the House with that conviction, but after listening to the magnetic speech of the Leader of the Irish Party, he almost regretted that he had committed himself to a policy of instalments, because the time had come for removing this blot upon our social system right at our very door. He would suggest that if the Irish Party accepted this compromise and agreed to a settlement by instalments they should insert the usual default clause to the effect that in the event of failure in regard to one instalment the whole should become due. Upon this matter he for one was prepared to take the plunge. In conclusion, he wished to say that in making these somewhat rambling observations—for if that was not the privilege of a debate on the Address he utterly failed to understand the meaning of what had been going on for the past two days—he was only voicing the aspirations of a democratic constituency which was tired of that spurious form of democracy which simply claimed the right to fraternise upon terms of equality with our social superiors; he was actuated by no other desire than to bring whatever ability and experience he possessed to the loyal support of a Ministry which was pledged to bring about the reforms he had referred to, and if he made the interests of the poor and lowly his first concern it was because he felt that in this way he was not only best serving his country, but was at the same time best proving his loyalty and devotion to His Majesty—his person, his empire, and his throne.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said he had listened with mixed feelings to the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. The hon. Member had told them that he was an independent Member of this House. As a supporter of the Government he hoped they would have his independence rather than his loyalty.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: Why?

MR. MADDISON: Because the hon. Member had, in flippant language, treated the fiscal question as an open one. He had told the House that if certain other things failed he should fall back on fiscal reform. He had treated the question which had agitated the country lately as a light matter and as one of no concern.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: I said that failing any of the measures I referred to, men might almost be tempted to turn to tariff reform.

MR. MADDISON said that nothing had been more significant during the debate on the Address than the failure of the Protectionist Members opposite to avail themselves of the convenient opportunity given to them to show that they had a remedy for the many evils which abounded. The hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield could only refer to two strongholds of Protection. One was Birmingham. For his own part, he did not grudge the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham any credit he could take from having a commanding influence in that great city. Sheffield had been referred to as the other stronghold. Were hon. Members aware that in Sheffield there was an actual majority of Free Trade votes recorded? Another significant feature was that there were over fifty workmen in the House, and though, without doubt, there would be some subjects on which they would differ as friends, there was not among them a single Protectionist Member. One moral of the elections was that the working classes of this country distrusted entirely the policy of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. No one could be in public life without being deluged by proposals for remedying unemployment; but of all the mad proposals, those with least reason in them were the proposals associated with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman started badly, because there was not a statesman living who was more distrusted by the great mass of organised workmen than he was. That was no doubt very hurtful to his cause. The working classes knew that his proposals were impossible on his own showing without the taxation of food. He was quite aware of the ingenious way in which the right hon. Gentleman adjusted the balance so as to make it appear that the carrying out of his proposals would only cost a farthing per week, but the taxation of food was there, and the instinct was not wrong which impelled the working men to resist the taxation of food. He was not a political economist, but he was sure it was sound economics to keep taxes off the necessaries of life. Such taxes made it harder for the working man to live. Consequently, there would be depression, and that would prevent working men from being such factors in production as they otherwise would be. What had the textile operatives—whose representatives he was delighted to be associated with in this House—seen? Whilst they had stood up for their rights against their employers they had realised that it was possible to increase the cost of production and so restrict the market without benefiting the workman. Taxation of food did that. So long as the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham rested in any degree on the taxation of food, they were doomed to ignominious failure. Protection was parochialism gone mad. Free trade was a great peace-maker. By free trade they meant free imports. Let there be no quibbling about words. In the Address there were references to unemployment. Of all the distressing conditions of our social and economic state, nothing was more deplorable than that men, willing and able to work, should yet be unable to get work. The working classes were not so lost to sense as to suppose that they would improve their position by taxing goods, and so restricting the demand for them. He was glad to see at the head of the Local Government Board a man in whom some of his friends had a pride which it was difficult to express. The right hon. Gentleman's heart throbbed true to the great masses of the people from whom he came and among whom he still remained. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would attempt no flighty experiments. The means specially devised for the relief of unemployment generally did the least good. The unemployed could not be helped except by something which increased the general wealth of the country. To find mere work was not to solve the difficulty; and he hoped the terrible waste of public money for unproductive purposes would cease. In the course of the debate the hon. Member for the Wirral division of Cheshire, a great employer of labour, and the hon. Member for the Blackfriars division of Glasgow, a great trade union leader, had united in very nearly the same terms in asking the Government and the House not to give old-age pensions to-morrow — they were too wise for that—but to regard this as an urgent and not an academic question—a work for practical statesmanship on the path of ordered reform. He deeply regretted that the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had towards the end of his speech made a dogmatic statement which he himself believed he should carry Members with him in repudiating. The hon. Member has said that three sides of the House were under the control of men whose pocket interests were diametrically opposed to those of the working classes; and that it was essential that there should be one section of the House who represented the workers, the poor, and those who had hitherto been without friends. He took it that one of those sections was the Party led by the hon. Member for Waterford. He did not believe that that Party was controlled and tenanted by men chiefly dominated by their pocket interests. In the weary days of Opposition the Radicals never had more stalwart friends than the Irish Members when they were attacking powerful vested interests. The other section referred to was that apparently led by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. He would not like to say that even about them, although their policy very often approached that description. The remaining section was the Liberal section. The Member for Merthyr Tydvil must clearly understand that he, and those who sat with him, had no monopoly of interest in the poor—had no special mandate to represent the poor—and no exclusive possession of independent action for the poor. Independence was a word almost as badly misused as liberty. We were at the beginning of a new Parliament. The Government was led by a statesman who in the dreary days of Opposition had remained faithful. He had shown his faith in the only way it could be shown—by his works in the King's Speech — and he asked hon. Members led by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil not to make invidious distinctions, but to judge men by what they did, and by how they voted. Then together they would achieve some little. It was only a little that Parliaments could do. The great forces that made men were largely outside of Parliament altogether, but that little should be done as well as possible.

LETTING OF HOUSES IN SCOTLAND.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) moved an Amendment to the Address respectfully submitting to His Majesty that the present system of the letting of smaller houses in the burghs of Scotland inflicts great inconvenience and hardship, and calls for reform in the interest of landlords, their factors, and the tenants. He said he would not apologise for bringing forward this grievance in the form of an Amendment to the Address. Scotchmen did not, as a rule, obtrude their grievances on the House, and he hoped, therefore, that the matter to which he now called attention would receive careful consideration. He had during the fourteen years he had been a Member of the House endeavoured to get an opportunity for bringing this topic before the House, but without success. The grievance to which the Amendment referred was one which bore hardly on the operative classes in Scotland, and affected one half, if not three-fourths, of the population in that country. The system of tenure of which they complained was one which involved the holding of houses for long periods of time causing great hardships to thousands who, on account of the exigencies of their occupations, or for other reasons, had to change their places of abode at short notice. It was the practice of landlords to demand that tenants of houses in January or early in February should sign an agreement by which they became tied to the houses for a period of seventeen or eighteen months, without break or release, and compelled to pay the rent whether they occupied the house or not. If the tenant lost his work, or was forced to move to another place, he remained under obligation for the rent of the house for the whole period; that was felt to be a great hardship, very grievous and inequitable, and one which could be reformed without injury to any interest concerned. This grievance was felt by all occupiers of houses rented at under £30 and £40, but he was dealing more particularly with the case of those whose houses were rented at less sums. The necessity for Parliamentary action in legislation arose because the landlords practically acted together. They sent in these demands, termed "missives," all at one time; and the tenants were compelled to return them signed within ten days, under penalty, in event of non-compliance, of having their houses let over their heads. The tenants were really unable, under the circumstances, to help themselves. Besides, the question of the rates and taxes had to be dealt with, so that these could be collected from the landlords, and recovered by them from the tenants along with the rent, as in England. All this was necessary in the interest of everybody, under the conditions of life in the industrial centres in Scotland prevailing at the present time. The present system was antiquated and a relic of the time when houses had gardens attached to them. In the old days it was most reasonable that a man who proposed to occupy a house should fix upon his house early in the year, and so get possession of the garden at a time when the operations incidental to cultivation could be carried on. There were no gardens now. The system thus prevailing in Scotland still, had long ago become unknown in England, where, he believed, it would not be permitted for one day. It was a state of affairs which had become intolerable to the minds of the working classes. He submitted that the grievance was very great; that the subject was very important—and suggested as a remedy that the House of Commons should enact that whatever period be fixed for the payment of the rent, the same should become the period of the tenure. It was shorter tenancies that were wanted, and more frequent payments of rental. These would be easier met by people whose wages came in in small sums, and to whom accumulation for quarterly or half-yearly payments was difficult or impossible. The point was to make the tenancy and the period of payment of rent of shorter date, as in England. In almost all the centres of population in Scotland there had been established now many associations for the purpose of finding a remedy to this great evil. The chief corporations in that country had also taken up the subject, and condemned this system. The town council of the great city of Glasgow had convened a conference of Scottish corporations and burghs last week on the subject. Public opinion was demanding in determined voice that a reform should be effected, and at once; very many Members of Parliament were pledged to support the reform. He thought that he had said enough to show that this question should be dealt with by the Government at the earliest opportunity, and that some reasonable remedy should be provided for a state of affairs which was not consistent with the comfort or welfare of the working classes of Scotland. He did not propose his Amendment in any hostile spirit to the Government; he was only anxious that a Bill, which had been drafted on the subject, should pass its Second Reading, and be remitted to a Committee upstairs for detailed consideration. He begged to move.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) said he had much pleasure in seconding the Amendment. He trusted that the proposal of the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment would receive the serious consideration of the Government, so that the law, which at present was a serious burden on the working classes, would be amended at the earliest possible opportunity.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the present law and practice in the letting of smaller houses in the burghs of Scotland, and the missive system prevailing in connection therewith, by which tenants are required by landlords in the month of January, or early in February, in each year, to sign a missive form taking their dwelling houses and becoming responsible for the rent thereof, from the term of Whit Sunday until the term of Whit Sunday in the year following, stands in need of immediate amendment and reform, we respectfully submit to Your Majesty that the present practice inflicts great inconvenience and hardships in the cities and larger burghs, especially on these classes who have to change their dwellings at any other time of year than the term of Whit Sunday, and that the reform called for is really in the interest of landlords and their factors as well as of the tenants.'"—(*Mr. Alexander Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) said that this was a subject which had been brought before the House year after year by his hon. friend opposite, with much pertinacity, and he congratulated him on his admirable assiduity. He would not now discuss the merits of the Bill to which the hon. Gentlemen had referred, and he did not question that public opinion in Scotland had been ripened on this subject by the hon. Member's praiseworthy efforts. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the association of the burghs of Scotland, which had taken up this matter. He understood that only two days ago arrangements were made for that association to visit the Secretary for Scotland; and he would ask the hon. Member to accept his assurance, in behalf of the Secretary for Scotland, that the representations of the association would receive sympathetic consideration on the part of His Majesty's Government. It was only fair to state that there were two sides to the question, even from the point of view of the working classes; the possibility of making easy the quick dishousing of larger numbers, say, at the instances of a single capricious owner or employer, would have to be considered; and there were elements for discussion when the topic was brought before the House in the shape of a Bill. In these circumstances he thought that the subject was not one of sufficient magnitude to justify an Amendment to the Address, and he suggested that his hon. friend, having received the assurance he had now given, would be good enough to allow the main business of the House to proceed.

*MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that, as an employer of labour, he could state that the existing law in regard to the tenancy of houses in the burghs of Scotland often proved a great hardship to the working classes, and he hoped that it would soon be amended.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said that he accepted the assurance which the Lord Advocate had given, and he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said that an Amendment appeared on the Paper in his name in regard to the abolition of flogging in the Navy. He thought that they ought not to begin the discussion of an Amendment of such magnitude at that time of night. He had not expected that his Amendment would have been reached that night. Therefore, he begged to move the adjournment of the House.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN Stirling Burghs.): I think my hon. and learned friend does not bear in mind the fact that the reason for an early adjournment on the first night of the session is that hon. Members are anxious to know what has been going on outside the House, and to hear the comments of other people on the contents of the King's Speech. That practice has never been extended to the second night, and I think it would be an evil example to depart from the rigid Parliamentary virtue which always distinguishes my hon. and learned friend. Therefore, I cannot assent to the Motion.

Question, "That the House do now adjourn," put, and negatived.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that if he did not speak now he supposed he would forfeit his chance of bringing forward his Amendment.

*MR. SPEAKER: Quite strictly the hon. and learned Member has already forfeited his chance; but I am sure that the House will indulge him if he is prepared to make his speech now.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that he had really come to an arrangement to suit the convenience of the Secretary to the Admiralty that this debate should not be taken to-night. However, seeing that they had been discussing for two days, off and on, the servile condition of the Chinese on the Rand, he felt himself pretty well justified in asking the House to look a little nearer home, and to consider what was going on in our ships of war every day. As he did not expect his Motion to come on to-night, he had neither the Amendment nor the notes of his speech in his hand, but, in these circumstances, he believed he would speak much more from his heart than from his head. Although flogging in the Army had been abolished for twenty-six years the practice still existed in the Navy. At the present moment every British ship-of-war had, as a part of its necessary equipment, a cat-o'-nine-tails. Since 1881 the law gave full permission to the captain of a man-of-war to inflict twenty-five lashes on a man, just as, in the same way, every man in Ireland was subject to illegal trial by coercion magistrates. The possibility of every man who entered the Navy being subjected to the lash carried with it a degrading element. Since he had taken this matter up he had been flooded with correspondence from fathers and mothers of seamen of the Royal Navy. A boy in the Navy for enlisting purposes was only sixteen-and-a-half years of age, but for flogging purposes he was eighteen years of age. According to the King's regulations, Article 759, every boy in the Navy was liable to birching or punishment with the cane, and that punishment could be inflicted either summarily or by sentence of a court-martial. The birching was done on the bare breech, with a birch rod nine ounces in weight, which was twice as heavy as a juvenile birch. But the birch-rod was made more formidable by being steeped in salt water, and then steamed for twenty-four hours before the operation was performed. A boy after sentence was immediately put into confinement, and kept in a bunk below water-mark for twenty-four hours. Then after he was birched he was removed to the sick bay where he was kept a close prisoner. Was there any wonder that some boys had committed suicide as the result of this punishment? The cane used in flogging was half-an-inch thick and three feet long. The underclothing was taken away, so that only thin white pants were left on, and then the cane came into full operation. The reason why the pants were kept on was that the doctors were afraid of blood-poisoning setting in if the cane came in contact with the body. He would now tell the House some of the offences for which these boys in the Navy had been caned and birched. Although the pain caused by flogging was very great the moral degradation was greater, and he pitied young lads upon whom came this awful loss of self-respect. It was demoralising to everybody concerned, and it was demoralising to the honour of this country. He had heard this kind of flogging compared with that inflicted by the headmasters in our public schools, but there was all the difference in the world between the two. No comparison could be made between flogging in the Navy and flogging by headmasters in public schools. The two systems of punishment were entirely different in their moral and bodily effects, as well as in the way in which they were viewed by the boys. Under the King's regulations, all the boys on board ship must be present and must witness the flogging. The effects upon the other boys of seeing the infliction of this punishment were simply terrible. There was one case where a boy was flogged on board a first-class cruiser, and one of the boy's comrades saw the blood slashing about. He happened to be a man of excitable temperament, and he was so enraged at seeing his comrade treated in this way that he went for the commanding officer. But what afterwards became of him? He got twenty-four lashes and three months' imprisonment himself. It had been said that this flogging was done to maintain discipline, but he had ventured upon one occasion to tell the gentleman responsible for inflicting it in one particular case that it was done to produce terrorism. He had in his possession a letter from a seaman describing some of these floggings, and he used very strong language in reference to these cruelties. He declared in his letter that upon one occasion while a boy was being flogged the blood splashed into his face, and he described in detail the horrible effects of birching. After these floggings the deck became a kind of slaughterhouse. The terror and agony was simply awful, for they caused the organs of the body to act involuntarily, and those who have had to witness them declare that they could not possibly see such cruelties again for weeks. Mr. Pretyman told them last session about boys having to be kept in confinement after these floggings had been administered for fear that they should commit suicide. In August last he received a letter from the Mediterranean Fleet which stated that a boy, ordered to be flogged, had committed suicide. He made inquiries, and was informed by Lord Cawdor that the boy had committed suicide, but was not under sentence of flogging. The fact was that the boy knew he was about to be sentenced, and committed suicide in anticipation of it In the "Majestic" two boys had recently tried to kill themselves for the same reason. There was one law in the Navy for the rich and another for the poor. He had been twenty years in Parliament, and if he had been aware of the horrors of this flogging when he first entered the House it would have been abolished fifteen years ago. He had listened to tho speech of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil last night, and he saw enormous potentialities of what might occur. He told them of the chasm existing between the rich and the poor which might be widened at any moment. All he had to say was that if they wished to enlarge that chasm, and see the people of England take the law into their own hands, all they had to do was to preserve flogging in the Navy. This was the flogging of the children of the poor by the rich. Flogging was not the punishment of the rich, but simply the punishment of the humble boy who went into the Navy in order to economise the household expenses, and who hoped to be able to bring home a few shillings for father, mother, or his sister. He had received a letter from a clergyman in which he said that he hoped the House of Commons would not think for a moment that there was no such thing as flogging in the Navy as a permanent institution. He had seen letters from deserters, from boys and from able-bodied seamen who had been flogged, and they all confirmed his statement, that there was one law for the rich and another for the poor. [Cries of "No, no."] One could never contradict or cross-examine the "No, no," but in this matter he wished the Prime Minister to take heart of grace. He did not want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but he would not hesitate about keeping the House for five hours if he thought he could prevent even one case of flogging. He agreed that the condition of things had much improved in the Navy during the last sixty years, but he wished it to be clearly understood that he was not now attacking persons but the system of flogging in the Navy. He only wished to see these boys treated as human beings. They should not give all their sympathy to the Chinese in South Africa; they should also think of the boys at home. In the last speech he made upon this question in the House he stated that he relied upon the great Labour Party who were acquainted with the feelings and sufferings and infirmities of the poor, and hoped they would insist upon the hands of the rich being taken off their children for purposes of this kind. The Irish Members procured the abolition of flogging in the Army—a punishment which for generations it was the privilege of the rich to inflict upon the poor. The Irish had, he believed, procured for the English every single popular liberty they had, and he hoped that when the Prime Minister abolished flogging in the Navy he would thank the Irish Party, just as Wilberforce thanked them when slavery was abolished. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

*MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said he had much pleasure in seconding this Amendment. This was by no means the first time that this subject had been brought before the House of Commons. These punishments were not merely punitive and corrective, but they were cruelly vindictive, and calculated to inflict as much pain and torture as possible. It was stated in the debate last year that one of these poor boys, after having been flogged, had to be watched by the medical officer for many hours, because he was in a dreadful state of nervous excitement, and they had to watch him very closely in order to prevent him from committing suicide.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this day.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the county of Galway (North Galway Division), in the room of Thomas Higgins, esquire, deceased.—(*Captain Donelan.*)

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

Adjourned at two minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 21*st* *February*, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Aberdeen (Eastern Division), in the room of James Annand, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS].

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, that, in respect of the Bills comprised in the Report laid upon the Table by Mr. Speaker as intended to originate in the House of Lords, they have certified that the Standing Orders have been complied with in the following cases, viz. :—

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway.

Barry Railway.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bournemouth Corporation.

Bridgewater Canals.

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Railway.

Clacton Urban District Council.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply.

Crediton Lighting and Power.

Croydon Corporation Water.

Crystal Palace Company.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.

Dover Corporation.

Dover Harbour Board.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.).

Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.

Fulwood Urban District Water.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.

Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.

Haslingden Corporation.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.

Holyhead Water.

H. R. Baines and Company

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).

Hull Joint Dock.

Kent Collieries Electricity Supply.

Kent Electric Power.

Kidderminster Gas.

Knott End Railway (Extension of Time).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.

Llandrindod Wells Gas.

London and North Western Railway.

London Squares and Enclosures.

Manchester Churches.

Manchester and Milford Railway.

Maryport Harbour.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.

Mersey Railway.

Milford Docks.

Mirfield Gas.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

National Assurance Company of Ireland, and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).

Newport Corporation.

Newport Harbour Commissioners.

Newtownards Urban District Council.

North Sussex Gas and Water.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.

Penllwyn Railway and Road.

Portsmouth Water.

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).

Rugby Subordinate School.

Sheffield Assay Office.

Sheffield District Railway.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time).

Thames Harbour.

Trent Navigation Company.

Truro Gas.

Vauclain's Patent.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.

West Yorkshire Tramways.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).

Wolstanton United District Council Gas.

And they have certified that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in the following cases, viz. :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway [*Lords*].

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay [*Lords*].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Heacham Water.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).

London United Tramways.

Middlesex County Council (Tramways).

Romford and District Tramways.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Additional Electrical Power Supply (London) Bill,—" to incorporate a Company and to confer upon such Company powers for the production, transmission, utilisation, and supply of electrical energy," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill,—" for incorporating and conferring powers on the Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Ascot District Gas Electric Lighting Bill,—"to empower the Ascot District Gas Company to supply electricity; and to confer further powers on and to change the name of the Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Bacup Corporation Bill,—"to extend the time limited by The Bacup Corporation Water Act, 1898, for the construction of waterworks; to confer further powers upon the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Bacup in relation to their water and electricity undertakings, and to make further provisions with regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the said borough; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill,—"to confer further powers on the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Bristol Corporation Bill,—"to empower the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the city of Bristol to make a new road; to alter the wards of the city; to extend the city and county of Bristol; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill,—"to empower the Brixham Gas Company to supply electricity, and to confer further powers on the company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Burry Port Gas and Improvement Bill,—"to empower the Urban District Council of Burry Port to supply gas and to make further and better provision with regard to the improvement, health local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes' presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Cardiff Gas Bill,—"to confer further powers on the Cardiff Gas Light and Coke Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Carlisle Corporation Bill,—"to empower the Corporation of Carlisle to acquire additional lands for the purposes of their Geltsdale Waterworks; to extend the time for the completion of those works; to authorise the Corporation to borrow further moneys for the purposes of their gas and water undertakings; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway Bill,—"to enable the Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company, Limited, to make certain extensions of their existing undertaking in the counties of Leitrim and Roscommon; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill,—"to confer further powers upon the Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Company, Limited," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Cheltenham Gas Bill,—"to confer further powers upon the Cheltenham Gas Light and Coke Company; and to make further provisions with reference to the undertaking of that company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

City of London Electric Lighting Bill, —"for conferring further powers on the City of London Electric Lighting Company, Limited, and other companies and bodies with respect to the supply of electrical energy; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Cork and Waterford Railways Bill,—"to incorporate the Cork and Waterford Railways Company; and for making railways in the county borough of Cork and in the counties of Cork and Waterford; and to confer running, working, agreement, subscription, and other powers on the Company and on certain Railway Companies and others; to authorise certain public bodies to grant guarantees or to subscribe; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill,—"to incorporate the Cork City Railways Company; and to authorise the Company to construct railways and other works in the county borough of Cork; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Cork Link Railways Bill,—"for incorporating the Cork Link Railways Company and for empowering them to construct railways in the county borough of Cork; and for conferring powers on certain existing railway companies and others; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill,—"to empower the Corporation of London to widen Blackfriars Bridge; to construct a tramway thereover and to confer other powers upon them with respect to that and other bridges; to authorise agreements between the Corporation and the London County Council; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Derby Gas Bill,—"for extending the limits of supply of the Derby Gas Light and Coke Company; to enable that Company to acquire the undertakings of the Spondon Ockbrook and Borrowash Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, and the Mickleover and Etwall Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill,—"to alter and regulate the capital and borrowing powers of the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Company; to extend the powers of the Company for the supply of electrical energy within their statutory area; to make agreements with local authorities, companies, and others for the supply of electricity within such area; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Dowlais Gas Bill—"for incorporating and conferring powers upon the Dowlais Gas and Coke Company, Limited; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill—"to confirm an agreement between the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company and the Dublin and Kingstown Railway Company; and to confer powers on the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company as to the alteration, conversion, and consolidation of their existing debenture, preference, and ordinary stocks, and as to capital and borrowing powers and other matters; to change the name of the Company and of their undertaking and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill,—"for conferring further powers upon the Epsom and Ewell Gas Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill,—"to remove the restrictions in respect of sulphur compounds (other than sulphuretted hydrogen) now imposed upon certain Gas Companies," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Great Eastern Railway Bill,—"for conferring further powers upon the Great Eastern Railway Company; for authorising the abandonment of certain works; for extending the time limited by former Acts; for the completion of works and the purchase of lands; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Great Northern Railway Bill,—" to empower the Great Northern Railway Company to construct a railway and other works; and to purchase additional Lands; to extend the time for the completion of works and compulsory purchase of lands by the Company; to authorise the Company to contribute to the cost of the generating station of the Great Northern and City Railway Company; and to raise additional capital; to authorise the construction of a railway and works by the Company and the Great Central Railway Company, and to confirm the purchase of lands by those Companies; to authorise the construction of a railway and works by the South Yorkshire Line Joint Committee, and to revive and extend the powers for the compulsory purchase of certain lands under The North Eastern Railway Act, 1902; to confirm the purchase of certain lands by the Cheshire Lines Committee and to extend the time for the completion of works and the compulsory purchase of lands by that Committee; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Hackney Electricity Bill,—" to make further provision in regard to the supply of electrical energy by and to the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of Hackney; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill,—" for incorporating the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Company; and for empowering them to construct railways in the counties of London and Middlesex; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill,—" to confer powers upon the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust, Limited, for the purpose of enabling that company to develop and lay out lands as garden suburbs," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Huddersfield Corporation Bill,—" to confer further powers on the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the County Borough of Huddersfield with respect to the disposal of trade refuse, for the construction of tramways and street works, and in regard to streets, buildings, sewers, and sanitary matters, and for the health, local government, and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Kettering Water Bill,—" to extend the time for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands authorised by The Kettering Urban District Water Act, 1901, to provide for the transfer of the water undertaking of the Kettering Urban District Council, in the parish of Weekley, to the Kettering Rural District Council; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, —" to empower the Corporation of Kingston-upon-Hull to construct a wharf, pier, and railways, to lay down additional tramways, to execute certain street works, and to confer further powers on them in regard to their water and electricity undertakings and the health and improvement of the city; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill,—" to enlarge the powers of the Lancashire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

London and India Docks and Millwall Companies Dock Bill,—" for the amalgamation of the undertaking of the Millwall Dock Company with that of the London and India Docks Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

London and South Western Railway Bill,—" to confer further powers upon the London and South Western Railway Company, to authorise them to execute further works, to acquire additional lands, to empower that company and the Midland Railway Company, or one of them, to acquire additional lands in respect of an undertaking in which they are jointly interested, for amalgamating the Waterloo and City Railway Company and the Axminster and Lyme Regis Light Railway Company with the London and South Western Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill,—" to confer further powers on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company; and for other purposes." presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

London County Buildings Bill,—" to empower the London County Council to acquire lands for county offices; and construct an embankment in the River Thames; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill,—" to confer powers on the London County Council with respect to the supply of electrical energy in the Administrative County of London and neighbouring places; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill,—" to empower the London County Council to execute works and to acquire lands; to make provisions as to the drainage of parts of the borough of Hornsey; to empower the London County Council to establish a street ambulance service; to confer powers upon the Councils of certain Metropolitan Boroughs; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill,—" to confer further powers on the London Electric Supply Corporation, Limited, with respect to the supply of electrical energy; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

London Outer Circle Railway Bill,—" for making a railway between Feltham and the London and India Docks to be called the London Outer Circle Railway; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

London Southern Tramways Bill,—" to authorise the use on the tramways of the London Southern Tramways Company of mechanical power, and to empower that Company to purchase lands and construct works, and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill,—" to incorporate the Macclesfield and District Tramways Company, and to empower that Company to make and maintain tramways and other works in the county of Chester; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Manchester Corporation Bill,—" to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Manchester with reference to the construction of tramways and other works, and the acquisition and appropriation of lands, and with respect to matters affecting the health and good government of the city; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Merthyr Tydfil Gas Bill,—" to authorise the Merthyr Tydfil Gas Company to construct new works; to raise additional capital; to convert their existing capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill,—"to empower the Metropolitan District Railway Company to construct new railways and a subway; to acquire lands; to constitute their surplus lands a separate undertaking; to raise further capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill,—"to confer further powers on the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company, Limited," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Metropolitan Railway Bill,—"to confer further powers upon the Metropolitan Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Metropolitan Water Board Bill,—"to empower the Metropolitan Water Board to make additional waterworks and sewerage and other works, and to dispose of the sewage of certain districts in the valleys of the Rivers Lee and Stort; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill,—"to make further provision for preventing the pollution and obstruction of streams in the county of Middlesex, and to confer further powers on the County Council of Middlesex for that purpose, and in relation to the width and maintenance of roads, employment agencies, ice cream vendors, gipsy encampments, quarter sessions, rating of cemeteries, recreation grounds, Brentford Market, and Runnymede Rifle Range; for amending the London and Middlesex (Adjustment) Scheme, 1905; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Midland Railway Bill,—"to confer additional powers upon the Midland Railway Company for the construction of works, and upon that Company and the Midland and Great Northern Railways Joint Committee for the acquisition of lands, to provide for the vesting of the undertaking of the Halesowen Railway Company in the Midland Railway Company and the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Mid-Oxfordshire Gas Bill,—"for empowering the Mid-Oxfordshire Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, to carry on gas works, and supply gas in certain parts of the county of Oxford; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Millwall Dock Bill,—"to confer further powers upon the Millwall Dock Company with respect to superfluous lands," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

New Mills Urban District Council Bill,—"to authorise the Urban District Council of New Mills to purchase the Ollerset Waterworks Undertaking, and such portion of the waterworks and plant of the Stockport Corporation as is within the district of the Council, and to supply water throughout their district, and to make further provision in regard to the gas undertaking of the Council; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

North and South Shields Electric Railway Bill,—"to enlarge the powers of the North and South Shields Electric Railway Company with reference to the acquisition of lands and the construction of works," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

North East Lincolnshire Water Bill,—"for incorporating and conferring powers upon the North East Lincolnshire Water Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

North East London Railway Bill,—"for conferring further powers on the North East London Railway Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

North Metropolitan Tramways Bill,—"to provide for the winding up and dissolution of the North Metropolitan Tramways Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

North West London Railway Bill,—"for empowering the North West London Railway Company to extend and alter their authorised railways; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill,—"for the abandonment of the Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Peterborough Gas Bill,—"for consolidating the capital of the Peterborough Gas Company; for enabling that Company to acquire additional lands and to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Pontefract Corporation Bill,—"to vest in the Corporation of Pontefract the undertakings of the Pontefract Park Trustees and the Pontefract Gas Company, and to make further provision for the local government of the borough and the water supply thereto; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill,—"to extend the boundaries of the Rathmines and Rathgar Urban District, to confer further powers on the Urban District Council of Rathmines and Rathgar with respect to streets and sanitary and other matters for the improvement and good government of their district; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill,—"to confer further powers upon the Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Light Company," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

St. John's (Westminister) Improvement Bill,—"to authorise the construction of street improvements, the rearrangement of buildings, and the taking of lands in the parish of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, in the county of London; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

St. Pancras Electricity Bill,—"to empower the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of St. Pancras to continue and maintain their stations for generating and transforming electricity; and to amend The St. Pancras (Middlesex) Electric Lighting Order, 1883," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill,—"to make further provision in regard to the supply of electrical energy by and to the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of Shoreditch; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill,—"to incorporate the South Lincolnshire Water Company, with power to supply water within certain parishes in the county of Lincoln, and to authorise that company and the Urban District Council of Spalding to construct works and provide water; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill,—"to empower the South

Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Company, Limited, to enter into agreements with companies and local authorities with respect to the supply of electrical energy; to confer further powers on the Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill,—" to empower the South Metropolitan Gas Company to purchase lands; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

South Suburban Gas Bill,—" to make further provisions with respect to the gas supplied by the South Suburban Gas Company, and the price to be charged therefor; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill,—" to authorise the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company to raise additional capital for carrying out works within the area transferred to and vested in the Company by The South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Act, 1905; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Southampton Gas Bill,—" to authorise the Southampton Gaslight and Coke Company to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Bill,—" for conferring further powers on the Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Company," presented and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Thornton Urban District Gas Bill,—" to empower the Urban District Council of Thornton, in the county palatine of Lancaster, to supply gas, and to provide for the transfer to the Council of such portion of the gas works undertaking and plant of the Poulton-le-Fylde Urban District Council as is contained within the urban district of Thornton; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Todmorden Corporation Bill,—" to confer further powers upon the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Todmorden in relation to their water, gas, and electric lighting undertakings, to authorise them to provide and work motor omnibuses, and to make further provision with regard to the cleansing and improvement of the River Calder within the borough, and with regard to the health, improvement, and good government of the said borough; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill,—" to confer further powers upon the Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Light and Coke Company; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill,—" to extend the powers of the Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Company, Limited, with respect to the supply of electricity; and for other purposes," presented and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Uxbridge Gas Bill,—" for conferring further powers upon the Uxbridge and Hillingdon Gas Consumers Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Wandsworth and Putney Gas (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill,—" to repeal Section 38, sub-sections (d), (e), and (f) of The Wandsworth and Putney Gas Act, 1900," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill, —" to empower the Corporation of the

County Borough of Waterford to acquire the existing toll bridge and ferry rights over the River Suir at Waterford; to enable them to borrow moneys; to empower certain county and district councils to contribute moneys towards the purchase of the said bridge and ferry rights; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill,—"to extend the time limited by The Watford and Edgware Railway Act, 1903, for the construction of works and the purchase of lands; to authorise agreements between the Watford and Edgware Railway Company and other Companies; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Watford Gas Bill,—"to consolidate the capital of the Watford Gas and Coke Company; to confer further powers on the company with respect to the raising of additional capital; to extend the limits of supply of the Company; to authorise the Company to acquire by agreement the undertakings of the Chesham Gas and Coke Company, Limited, and the Amersham Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited; to authorise the construction and maintenance of additional gas works; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill,—"to authorise the Association of Electric Supply Undertakers in the West of London; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

West Middlesex Roads Bill,—"to authorise the construction of new roads in the urban districts of Brentford and Heston and Isleworth, in the county of Middlesex; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

Wigan and Heysham Railway Bill,—"for incorporating the Wigan and Heysham Railway Company, and authorising them to construct railways in the county of Lancaster; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING).

Petition from Whitby, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PUBLIC OFFICES SITE (DUBLIN) ACT, 1903.

Account [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 41].

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 42].

WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED SEAMEN.

Accounts [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 43].

TRADE AND NAVIGATION.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 44].

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3522 to 3531 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 643 and 644 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 2, 1906).

Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and France respecting Telegraphic Communication between Mauritius and Réunion. Signed at Paris, 6th December, 1905. Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY AND MILITIA.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES, 1906.

Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council relative to Military Manœuvres, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BREWERS' LICENCES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 45].

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1904–5.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 46].

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 47].

NATIONAL GALLERY (REPORT).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. McKenna*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 48].

TRANSVAAL (CHINESE LABOURERS) (CRIMES).

Address for "Return of the Crimes committed by Chinese Labourers who have deserted from the Mines of the Witwatersrand district upon the European or other inhabitants of the Transvaal since June, 1905."—(*Mr. Mackarness.*)

QESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE NOTES.

Lord Grenfell's Appointment.

MR SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether Lord Grenfell has been given an extension of the period of the tenure of his appointment as General Commanding in Chief the forces in Ireland; and, if so, on what grounds has this extension of the term of the tenure of his office been granted to him.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). General Lord Grenfell was appointed to command the troops in Ireland on May 10th, 1904, for a period of three years, a tenure then capable of extension to five years. Since that date the Army Council decided that all such commands and staff appointments were to be for four years, and extensions of one year have, therefore, been given to present occupants.

Volunteer Regulations.

SIR CHARLES McLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): To ask the Secretary of State for War what steps he proposes to take to reassure the Volunteers that the regulations laid down by his predecessor in office will be abandoned. and that the feelings and needs of the force will be considered and supported by His Majesty's Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) To reply to the first part of the Question would involve a full statement on the measures which the Government propose to take in regard to the Volunteer Force, and it would not be possible to make such a statement within the limits of a reply to a Question. I hope, therefore, that my hon. and learned friend will permit me to defer my Answer to a future opportunity. As regards the second part of the Question, I can assure the House that the feelings and real needs of the Volunteer Force will be considered and supported by the Government.

Royal Hibernian Military School—Appointment of Sergeant.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that in a notice of the vacancy in the position of sergeant for the instruction of the boys of the Royal Hibernian Military School, in which applications for the post were invited and which was issued by Lord Grenfell, it was stated that the applicant must, amongst other qualifications for the position, be a member of the Church of

England; under what, if any, authority was Lord Grenfell enabled to limit the candidates for this appointment in Ireland to members of the English Established Church, to the exclusion of members of other religious denominations in Ireland, including not only the Catholic but the Irish Protestant members; whether Lord Grenfell has been asked for any explanation of this notice issued with his sanction and under his name, and, if so, what has been his explanation; whether a sergeant a member of the English Church was actually appointed; and whether the limitation of Army appointments to members of one communion only has received his sanction.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The selection for the appointment in question rests entirely with the Governors of the Royal Hibernian Military School. I am accordingly in possession of no information in regard to the case mentioned, but I will make further inquiry and an Answer shall be sent to the hon. Member.

Proposed National Indemnity Committee.

MR. RUSSELL REA (Gloucester): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government have taken any steps, or intend to take any steps, to carry out the unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission on Supply of Food and Raw Material in Time of War, that a small expert Committee should be appointed to frame a scheme of national indemnity.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) This question is under consideration by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Militia Field Service Dress.

MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state why, when the new field service dress is being issued to the Militia, the cap for the same is not being also issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The pattern of service dress cap for the Militia was finally adopted last October, but it will not be taken into use until the small remaining stocks of the present cap and cover have been used up.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Navy Contracts.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any instructions have recently been given to alter the form of Admiralty specifications for goods supplied by contractors for the use of the Navy; and, if so, what is the precise nature of such alterations, and whether it is proposed to cancel or alter any provisions hitherto existing in Admiralty specifications that goods supplied by contractors should be of British material or manufacture.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The Answer is in the negative.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any change has been made in Admiralty contract specifications as to the use of British materials; and, in such case, what is the reason for the alteration, and how the Fair Wages Clause can be insisted upon if contractors are free to use articles of Foreign manufacture not produced under the legislative provisions of the British Factory Acts or in accordance with the custom established by British trades unions.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer is in the negative.

Volunteer Uniform Contracts—Alleged Sweating of Workers.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the case of the application of Mrs. Thorogood to the Lambeth Board of Guardians for outdoor relief has come under his notice; if he is aware that Mrs. Thorogood has been receiving for trouser-making wages averaging a penny per hour, and that the trousers made by her were for the Volunteers; if so, will he say if they were made under Government contract; and, if so, if he will investigate the matter, and see that such practices shall be rendered impossible in the case of War Office contracts in future.

MR. J. R. MACDONALD (Leicester): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Mrs. Thorogood, who stated to the Lambeth Board of Guardians that she was working upon Volunteer uniforms at a wage of 1¼d. per hour; whether he will consider if these contracts can be brought under the Government Fair Wages Clause; and whether Volunteer uniforms could be made in the Army Clothing Factory.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): If the allegation had been made in regard to work upon a War Department Contract I would gladly have enquired into the matter. But as the Volunteers make their own arrangements for obtaining their clothing it is not within my power to intervene. As regards the last paragraph of the Question of the hon. Member for Leicester, the resources and accommodation available at the Royal Army Clothing Department are not sufficient to meet the extensive Volunteer requirements in addition to those of the Regular Army and Militia.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will you take steps to prevent Volunteer officers availing themselves of work done under such conditions by, say, deducting something from the Capitation Grant?

Mr. HALDANE: It is not a matter we could manage in that way. They make their own arrangements. The Grant is not given for uniform alone, but for services rendered.

Mr. J. R. MACDONALD: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of increasing the accommodation at the Army Clothing Factory, so as to put an end to this state of things?

Mr. HALDANE: If we did that we should have to take over the supply of clothing to Volunteers. It is a matter requiring consideration. I can give no pledge.

Mr. SEAVERNS: Cannot you make representations to those responsible?

Mr. HALDANE: I trust the publicity given to this Question will have the necessary effect. It is not desirable that these things should continue.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR: (Kildare, N.) Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a factory at Limerick capable of supplying the whole British Army with uniforms.

The Transvaal War Contribution.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps were taken by His Majesty's late Administration to secure to the taxpayers of this Country the contribution of £30,000,000 which the late Colonial Secretary stated the Transvaal Colony and a certain group of financial houses engaged in business in that Colony had undertaken to raise and pay in consideration of the loan of £35,000,000 granted to that Colony by the South Africa Loan and War Contribution Act, 1903, what was the nature of the security obtained or demanded by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham for the £30,000,000 in question, when he assented to such loan as the representative of the late Administration; and what steps His Majesty's present Ministers intend to take to make good to the Exchequer the £30,000,000 in question.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): I would refer the hon. Member to the statement made by the late Secretary of State in the House of Commons on 20th and 22nd March, 1905, and to his reference to the contribution in his despatch of 31st March (Page 5 of Cd. 2400) from which it appears that no effective steps were taken by His Majesty's late Government and that no actual security was obtained or demanded by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham for what his successor described as a debt of honour and a matter left for the decision of the new Elective Assembly. His Majesty's Government are not yet in a position to announce the action they propose to take in this matter, but having regard to the fact that the guarantee by the British Government of the South African Loan of £35,000,000 was given to some extent contingently upon the promise of this contribution, and that, in virtue of the guarantee, substantial pecuniary advantage has accrued to the Transvaal Colony, His Majesty's Government are by no means prepared to regard such an obligation as one which can be lightly set aside.

Natal Natives and the Poll Tax.

*Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will say on what ground and under what law the two Natives, recently shot in Natal, were tried by court-martial instead of by a civil tribunal; what is the amount of the poll-tax levied in Natal, and what is the total yield of that tax; and whether the persons who are required to pay it have any representation in the legislative body by which the tax is imposed, corresponding to the representation that the natives of Cape Colony enjoy in the Cape Parliament.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has no information yet as to the alleged shooting of two natives. Martial law has been in force in Natal since 9th February. The poll-tax recently enacted in Natal is a tax of £1 on all males over eighteen years including Europeans, but excluding indentured Indians, and natives paying hut-tax. I am not able to state the yield of the tax which only fell due on 1st January last. The tax is not confined to natives. In Natal coloured persons are excluded from the franchise as a class, but the Governor in Council may grant a certificate exempting particular persons from the disability.

Swedish Magnetic Iron Ore.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Foreign Office has been called to proposals now before the Swedish Legislature for the imposition of an export-tax on Swedish magnetic iron ore, an article which is essential in the manufacture of iron in this Country; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made on the subject, and make representations to the Swedish Government with a view to causing such proposals to be abandoned.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs): The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. I will inquire whether the proposals are likely to be adopted.

Foreign Office Questions.

Sir H CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I take this occasion of stating to the House the arrangements that we propose with regard to the answering of Foreign Office Questions? The House is aware that for the first time for a great many years the Foreign Secretary is a Member of the House. I need hardly point out that for the purposes of discussion and of keeping the hold of the House of Commons over the conduct of foreign affairs this is a very great advantage; but, unfortunately, the time when Questions are asked is the busiest hour with my right hon. friend in his office. He very often has to see the representatives of foreign Powers at the Foreign Office during the very hour when Questions are addressed to him in this House; and, therefore, what he has proposed, and what I think would be a very good arrangement, is this—that he should ask the House to receive the Answers to ordinary Questions from one of his colleagues, he promising to be as much in attendance here as is consistent with his duties elsewhere. If the House loses anything by this arrangement it must set against it the great gain it has in having the Foreign Minister in the House for all purposes. The Secretary to the Local Government Board, therefore, my hon. friend the Member for Dewsbury, will answer the Questions when the Foreign Secretary is not in his place. I think in that way both the convenience of the House and the execution of his proper duties by my right hon. friend will be served.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): Will supplementary Foreign Office Questions be permitted?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir. According to the rule which has been in force for a good many years, no supplementary Questions are allowed on foreign affairs, whether they be addressed to the Foreign Secretary or to any one acting for him.

* Earl PERCY (Kensington, S.): I must demur to that. The Prime Minister has stated what was no doubt a rule made tentatively two years ago, but it is a rule which was never observed in practice during last year, when supplementary Questions were constantly put to me and answered by me on almost every occasion.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Perhaps I put it too broadly in saying they were not allowed. I should rather say that the Minister answering Questions is at liberty to decline to answer them if he sees reason to do so.

*Earl PERCY: That is so, of course, whenever it would be contrary to the public interest to make a statement; but may I point out, while not in the least desiring to quarrel with any arrangement to facilitate the work of the Foreign Secretary, that the particular arrangement now proposed is open to this drawback, that the Secretary to the Local Government Board will under no circumstances be allowed to answer supplementary Questions. To whom then should they be addressed? To the Prime Minister or some other member of the Cabinet?

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): May I ask the Prime Minister whether he recollects that when the attempt was made by the late Leader of the House to lay down the rule stated, it was met instantly by a Motion for the adjournment, for which the whole of the Liberal Party voted.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As I have already said, I stated the matter too broadly when I said it was a rule. It is rather a practice subject to exceptions. I would point out that it would be very easy to get rid of the difficulty, and there would be no reason at all why my right hon. friend should not be transferred to another place, but he desires to remain in the House of Commons and to give the House of Commons the advantage of having the Foreign Secretary here.

Congo and the Soudan Frontier.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the nature of the attacks recently made by the troops of the Congo State upon the Soudan frontier; and will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

The SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): His Majesty's Government have no information as to any attacks having recently been made by troops of the Congo State on the Soudan frontier or as to any fighting having occurred. Certain posts have been established within territory considered by His Majesty's Government as indisputably belonging to the Soudan, and His Majesty's Government are in communication with the Government of the Congo on the subject.

Administration of the Congo State.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the treatment by agents of the Congo State of the inhabitants of that region; whether he will state the nature of the control of the Belgian Government over the Congo State; whether the European Powers have the right by treaty, or otherwise, to intervene in the administration of the Congo State; and, if so, whether he will approach these Powers with a view to pntting an end to the misgovernment of the natives.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Government are giving careful consideration to the question of the administration of the Independent State. Papers will shortly be laid before Parliament on the subject. In existing circumstances no control is exercised by the Belgian Government over the Congo State. I am not aware of any Treaty giving any of the Powers separately the right to intervene in the internal administration of the Congo State. The late Government invited, in 1903, the Powers who were parties to the Berlin Act, to join with His Majesty's Government in considering whether the obligations undertaken by the Free State at the Berlin Conference in regard to the natives had been fulfilled, but they obtained no promise of active support. Before taking any fresh steps in this direction His Majesty's Government must await the result of the Commission at Brussels which is considering the best means of carrying out the recommendations of the recent Commission of Enquiry.

Earl PERCY: Can the hon. Gentleman give the House any information as to the probable date on which the second Commission will report?

[No Answer was returned.]

Hours of Polling.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether his attention has been called to the difficulties experienced by working-men voters, in London especially, in recording their votes, as a result of the closing of the poll for parliamentary elections at 8 o'clock p.m.; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirableness of extending the hours of polling and of fixing Saturday as a general polling day.

The HOME SECRETARY (Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Leeds, W.): No representations have yet reached me officially to the effect that working-men voters find it difficult to record their votes before 8 p.m., but it is a matter which shall receive my attention.

London Cabmen's Licence Fees.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether it is proposed to retain the additional half-crown charge recently imposed in respect to cabmen's licences in London; if so, whether he will say why this fresh charge was imposed; and, if it is proposed to retain it, to what purposes it is intended to be put.

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE: With regard to this matter, I must first observe that it was never intended to make any additional charge for a cabman's licence, but only to require a deposit of 2s. 6d. for the badge, which would be paid once only and returned when the badge was given up. I propose to ask the House to appoint a Select Committee to consider this and certain other difficulties which have arisen in connection with the recent Metropolitan Public Carriage Order, together with other matters affecting cabs and omnibuses in the metropolis. In the meantime, I have made an Order suspending the operation of those of the regulations to which objection has been raised.

Musical Piracy.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if his attention has been called to a recent trial in which the loss to the musical profession and trade by pirates was shown; and whether, in view of the loss to members of the musical profession and of the fact that the industry has been brought almost to a standstill by the advantage taken by these pirates of defects in the existing law, he will introduce at an early date a measure to amend the law with regard to musical copyright.

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE: This matter is receiving my careful consideration. I desire strongly to see a remedy adopted to put an end to the hardships in this connection of which the musical profession justly complain; but I am not yet in a position to make any statement as to legislation.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I will renew the Question later on.

Foreign Seamen on British Ships.

Mr. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the judgment at the Board of Trade inquiry into the loss of the steamship "Ordovician," of Cardiff, and, in view of the fact that there have been three inquiries held at Cardiff within a month in connection with the wreck of vessels in which deck hands had been chiefly foreign seamen with no knowledge of English, he will consider the advisability of taking measures to prevent the employment on British vessels of alien seamen who are unable to speak or understand the English language.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): My attention has been called to the cases referred to in the Question, and I am making full inquiry into the incidents referred to in the course of the proceedings. I hope to be able to make some pronouncement on this subject when I introduce the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, of which I have given notice.

New German Tariff.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a new German tariff which comes into force on March 1st; whether he will state to what extent it increases the duties against British goods, or puts increased difficulties in the way of British traders doing business in Germany; and what action His Majesty's Government proposes to take in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The new German tariff has engaged the earnest attention of the Board of Trade. The extent to which it increases duties on articles imported from the United Kingdom will be seen on reference to the Return Cd. 2414 published by the Board of Trade in 1905. Representations as to the effect likely to be produced on British trade by the increased duties have already been made to the German Government on the advice of the Commercial Intelligence Committee.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: And what answer has been received from the German Government?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Negotiations are proceeding. I may be able to answer the hon. and gallant Member further later on.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Can we have the Answer before the new Treaty comes in force?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I must ask for notice.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): Have these increased duties enhanced the price of German goods?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: What has that to do with it?

[No Answer was returned.]

Labour Statistics—The Unemployed.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many skilled artisans and how many unskilled workers are now estimated to be out of employment in the United Kingdom; and how many of these are in London, Sheffield, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, and Dublin, respectively.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Returns from trade unions with a membership of 388,000, mostly skilled workmen, show that 27,614 were unemployed at the end of January. Returns from 120 Distress Committees constituted under the Unemployed Workmen Act show that from the time of establishment up to the end of January they had registered 90,411 persons, of whom about two thirds are estimated to be unskilled labourers. Of the total 42,093 were in London and neighbourhood, 2,009 in Sheffield, 1,938 in Glasgow, 2,705 in Leeds, and 2,322 in Liverpool. There was no Distress Committee in Dublin in January. The above are the only sources of statistical information on the subject referred to in the Question. I have no doubt the hon. and gallant Member will be delighted to learn that there is a general improvement in employment. At the end of January, 1905, the percentage of employment was 6·8 per cent.; at the end of January 1906, the percentage was 4·7 per cent.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I am very glad to hear it. But do not the returns refer almost entirely to skilled labour? Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate the figures to the Prime Minister in view of the paragraph in the King's Speech as to the prosperity of the country?

[No Answer was returned.]

Maconahy Estate, Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the vesting orders in the case of the Maconahy estate are so long delayed; and when the sale may be expected to go through.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): This estate is being dealt with in its order of priority. It is expected that the purchase agreements will be ruled on by the Estates Commissioners at an early date.

Longford Land Commission Valuer.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say when, and by whom, Mr. McElligott was appointed a Land Commission valuer in county Longford; whether he is aware that since Mr. McElligott's appointment the rent-fixing decisions in county Longford have averaged from twenty to forty per cent. higher than in the time of Messrs. Greene and Finlay; and whether he will look into the qualifications of Mr. McElligott to give a fair decision to tenant farmers, seeing that he was a land agent and is himself a small landlord.

MR. BRYCE: Mr. Elligott was appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant as a lay assistant Commissioner on December, 23rd, 1896; and his qualifications are stated in Parliamentary Paper, No. 151, of the year 1902. He is a member of the Sub-Commission at present engaged in disposing of Fair Rent applications in county Longford. I am unable to enter into the merits of the decisions of this court, but I would point out that if either of the parties to any case is aggrieved by its rulings he is entitled to appeal.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Does not the appointment expire on March 31st next?

MR. BRYCE: I will inquire if desired.

Compulsory Purchase Powers.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to bring in a Bill to confer compulsory powers of purchase on the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners.

MR. BRYCE: It is anticipated that the recent decisions of the Court of Appeal in Ireland as to the powers of the Estates Commissioners in regard to the purchase of land will have the effect of facilitating their operations in this respect; and the new Regulations issued by the Lord Lieutenant are calculated to produce a like effect. I must wait to see how the present system works under these Regulations and recent decisions before expressing any opinion on the point raised in the Question.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): While the right hon. Gentleman is waiting to see how the system works, will he take note of the number of years' purchase demanded by the landlords of untenanted lands? And will he give a Return on the point at the end of six months?

MR. BRYCE suggested that the Question should be put some months hence.

Cusack Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the present position as regards sale to the tenants and settlement of the evicted tenants of the Cusack, county Longford, Estate; whether any report has been received from the inspector as to the amount of untenanted land on this property; and when those evicted tenants whose claims have been sent in to the Estates Commissioners may expect a definite statement as to their chances of reinstatement.

MR. BRYCE: The report of the inspector in this case has been received and is under consideration by the Estates Commissioners. The claims of all evicted tenants who have lodged applications for reinstatement will be duly inquired into, and the Commissioners will consider whether untenanted land can be made available for them.

MR. FARRELL: Can we have the Report, or is it a privileged document?

MR. BRYCE: My impression is that these Reports are made solely for the information of the Commissioners and do not go outside the office.

Trinity College Estates.

*MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to what extent effect has been given to the recommendations of the Trinity College, Dublin, Estates Commission; and whether it is intended to introduce legislation this session to enable lessees holding under leases originally made for terms of ninety-nine years under The Trinity College, Dublin, Leasing and Perpetuity Act, 1851, to sell, as immediate landlords, under the Land Purchase Acts in the same manner as if not less than sixty years of the said terms were unexpired.

MR. BRYCE: This question is no doubt one of considerable importance, but legislation amending the Land Purchase Act would be required to effect the object suggested, and I am not at present in a position to make any general statement regarding the amendment of that Act.

*MR. LONSDALE: And meanwhile, thousands of tenants in Ireland are prevented buying their land.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is it not the fact the College refuse to sell their head rents under twenty-seven years' purchase?

MR. BRYCE: I cannot say.

MR. FLAVIN: It is so.

*MR. LONSDALE: Will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiry on this very important point?

MR. BRYCE: Of course all these important matters will have my attention.

Cork Butter Trade.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork Co., S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from Cork County Council, and various public and other bodies in Ireland, expressions of disapproval of the appointment of Lord Ikerrin as Butter Commissioner in England; and whether, in view of the necessity that exists of having a thoroughly competent man to fill this most important post, steps will be taken to transfer Lord Ikerrin to some other position.

MR. BRYCE: Some such expressions of disapproval have been received, but I am aware that representatives of the butter trade in Limerick and elsewhere have expressed strong approval of the appointment of Lord Ikerrin. The appointment in question is not that of a butter commissioner, but of an inspector, whose primary duty will be the detection of frauds in connection with the sale of Irish butter and other agricultural produce in Great Britain. The selection of Lord Ikerrin was made after consultation with representatives of the industries concerned, and with their approval. The appointment was made before I came into office, but I am informed that Lord Ikerrin possesses knowledge and experience qualifying him for the post. I may add that for nearly five years prior to the present appointment, Lord Ikerrin was employed by the Department as an inspector in connection with the transit of agricultural produce to English markets, and that the knowledge gained by him in that position will be of much advantage to him in his present post.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Will the question of Lord Ikerrin's appointment form part of the inquiry into the working of the Department, and will the county councils be represented on that inquiry?

MR. BRYCE: I do not consider there will be any difficulty in allowing county councils to make such representations as they may desire in relation to the protection of the butter industry, and they already have power to address themselves to the Agricultural Board. I shall be happy to forward to the body making the inquiry any communications that may be sent to me.

MR. EDWARD BARRY: Was the Cork butter trade, which is the centre of the industry, consulted before the appointment of Lord Ikerrin.

MR. BRYCE: I presume so, as I am informed the appointment was made after consultation with all the industries concerned.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Will this appointment be reviewed at the proposed inquiry?

MR. BRYCE: The inquiry will not necessarily extend to the qualifications of individual officers. It will be concerned with the constitution status and working of the Department.

Police and Irish Evictions.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant for Ireland if he is aware that on the M'Neale estate, situate at Clonkeen, Queen's County, legal proceedings without any previous demand, are constantly taken against the tenants for the current half-year's rent; that ejectment decrees were obtained against some of the tenants for one year's rent which included the hanging gale; that the tenants offered to purchase on terms giving the landlords their net rental; that this offer was refused, and 24½ years for the first and 27¾ years for the second term rents being demanded; and whether, seeing that on the 14th instant the county and district inspector, with a force of police, assisted at the eviction of one of the tenants, who with his wife and children were expelled from his holding of six acres, he will direct the Estates Commissioners to intervene with a view to bringing about a sale of this estate to the tenants on equitable terms.

MR. BRYCE: No application in connection with this estate has been made to the Estates Commissioners, and they have no information as to the matters referred to in the Question. I am, however, informed that on the 14th instant the police afforded protection to the sheriff in the execution of an ejectment decree on the estate. Beyond affording this protection, which they were legally bound to give, the police did not in any way assist in carrying out the eviction. As regards the last few lines of the Question I may add that if the Estates Commissioners think it would be beneficial to intervene in order to bring the parties to an amicable agreement they have full power to do so.

Irish Board of Agriculture—Mr. Porter's Salary.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the amount of the salary paid to Mr. Porter, an official of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland; what are his duties; and what are his qualifications for the discharge of those duties.

MR. BRYCE: Mr. Porter receives a salary of £955, which includes subsistence allowance when travelling. He was, in pursuance of the Act establishing the Department, transferred at this salary from the Land Commission, where he was superintendent of its Agricultural Department. His present duties are those of an inspector in the agricultural branch of the Department, and he has proved himself to be an efficient officer.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is it not possible to get a man to look after bees for less than £955 a year?

MR. BRYCE: Agriculture is a subject capable of receiving very high scientific treatment.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is not Mr. Porter's real qualification for the post to be found in the fact he is the son-in-law of Mr. Wrench, the Land Commissioner?

MR. KILBRIDE: What was his salary before he was transferred to the Bee Department?

MR. BRYCE: I cannot say.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Was he not first appointed an Assistant Land Commissioner, then transferred to the Congested District Board, and then pitchforked into the Board of Agriculture because it was impossible to find any work for him to do?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice should be given of these Questions.

Irish National School Rules.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Rule 127B of the National Board of Education in Ireland has been condemned by the managers of schools and by many public bodies in Ireland, he will request the Commissioners of National Education to withdraw the rule.

MR. BRYCE: This rule was passed with the object of providing that boys of tender years should be taught by female teachers. The rule as originally framed was, as the result of representations received from managers and others, modified to the extent of reducing the limit of age of the boys referred to from eight to seven years. I am not prepared to ask the Commissioners to withdraw the rule, which is in accord with the views of the most experienced educational authorities both here and in the United States.

Sir Horace's Plunkett's Position.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what conditions Sir Horace Plunkett continues to occupy the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland; whether he has been reappointed by the Liberal Government since their return to office; and, if so, whether the appointment is permanent or temporary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he is aware, that Sir Horace Plunkett in 1899 was appointed, as a Member of this House, to the office of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture, a Ministerial office held at the pleasure of the Crown, whose tenure depends on the existence of the Government of which the holder is a member, while the statute instituting the office provides that the person appointed thereto will not, if a Member of this House, vacate his seat, and will not be required to submit himself for re-election; and that from the time of his appointment to the dissolution of 1900 Sir Horace Plunkett continued to be a Member of this House and to answer Questions with reference to that Department from the Treasury Bench, and has, since the dissolution, several times unsuccessfully contested Parliamentary seats as a member of the late Government; why, under such circumstances, has Sir Horace Plunkett been permitted, alone of all the members of the late Government, to retain a political position and salary in a new administration; and whether there is any, and, if so, what precedent for the position in relation to the Government now held by this gentleman.

MR. BRYCE: In answering this Question, I will at the same time deal with the Question (No. 38) of the hon. Member for South Donegal, to which my right hon. friend, the First Lord of the Treasury, has asked me to reply. The facts respecting Sir Horace Plunkett's original appointment are substantially as stated in the Questions. I can best explain the present position by reading the following correspondence. On 20th December, 1905, I wrote to Sir Horace Plunkett:—Sir, I have had under consideration the arrangements necessary for conducting the duties of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland. In that connection I understand that you, regarding your appointment of Vice-President of the Department as having originally had a political character, were desirous of retiring from it on the change of Ministry. On this point I have consulted the Prime Minister, and with his concurrence I conceive that it may be proper for you to treat the matter as being one which lies, for the immediate purpose, outside considerations of Party, and I therefore hope that you will be disposed, viewing the arrangement as one of a purely provisional character, to carry on the duties of the Vice-Presidentship for the present. It is the intention of Government to examine fully into the organisation and working of the Department, and its relation with the other branches of the Irish Administration; and I think that your continuance for the present in the office of Vice-President of the Department would materially facilitate such an examination and help the Government to turn its results to the best account. They retain, I need hardly say, entire freedom as to their future action.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) JAMES BRYCE.

To the Right Hon.
Sir Horace C. Plunkett, K.C.V.O."

Sir Horace Plunkett replied as follows:—

105 Mount Street, London, W.
20th December, 1905.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of to-day's date. Proceeding on the assumption that the post of which I was the first occupant was one which changed with the Government, I had made all arrangements to vacate it as soon as any successor was appointed. Under the peculiar circumstances mentioned in your letter I shall be glad to meet the wishes of His Majesty's Government by continuing provisionally to discharge the duties of this post until such time as they may see fit to transfer it. During this period I shall regard the office as being non-Party in its character. I may say that in the exercise of my administrative functions I have never allowed myself to be influenced by any political opinions or leanings I may have. But I shall, of course, during my continuance in office consider myself debarred from taking any part in political controversy.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Signed) HORACE PLUNKETT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether there was any precedent for a gentleman occupying Sir Horace Plunkett's position—a gentleman who sat on the Treasury Bench as a Minister of the Crown—remaining in the same position under another Government, especially having regard to the fact that he had twice contested constituencies, and that in his election address in one of them (Galway) he talked about all the patronage that was at his disposal.

MR. DILLON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the nature of the inquiry to be instituted?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that question.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My view of the case is this—that the present state of things is purely temporary and purely exceptional. There is no intention, and there never has been any intention, of converting an office which is of one character into an office of another character with the same official serving in it. That has never been contemplated. But, as the whole matter was under review in order to place the department in many respects on a better footing, it was thought that there was no harm in continuing Sir Horace Plunkett in the position rather than make a new appointment which would have to be subject to any change found to be necessary.

Cavan Land Commission.

MR. KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the head Land Commission, which sat in Cavan on October 31st, 1905, has not yet given judgment in the cases then heard; and whether, as this delay causes real inconvenience to the public and professional men, he will say when the decisions may be expected.

MR. BRYCE: The Judicial Commissioner who heard the cases referred to, is at present absent from Dublin on circuit. He hopes, however, to be able to give judgment in all the cases on his return from circuit, and before the end of the presents Hilary sittings.

Sligo Conspiracy Trials.

*MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in November last, proceedings were instituted against two persons for conspiracy, to injure one John Padden by unlawful means, and that evidence was given that both these persons advocated publicly that Padden should be boycotted; and whether it is intended to take steps to bring these persons to trial.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool Exchange): At the request of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this Question. Proceedings were instituted against the two persons referred to, and both were tried at the last winter assizes held at Sligo, by the judge of assize and a special jury empannelled under the Crimes Act. The trial resulted in a disagreement of the jury It is not proposed to put the accused persons on trial a second time.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): Is it not the fact that the persons referred to in the Question were actually tried at the last Winter Assizes in Sligo, and that, notwithstanding the fact that the jury was shamefully packed by the representative of the late Attorney-General, eight of the twelve jurors were in favour of acquittal.

MR. CHERRY: I am not aware.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the number of challenges exercised by the Crown on this trial?

MR. CHERRY: I have no information; I was not then Attorney-General.

*MR. LONSDALE: Are we to understand that persons who may be boycotted in Ireland, are not to receive the protection of the law?

Mr. CHERRY: No, Sir, certainly not.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): As one of the criminals referred to, may I ask is it not the fact that the jury was exclusively Orange, and Unionist in its composition; and that all Catholics were ordered to stand aside? Was not the prosecution itself the dying kick of an expiring Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

Trinity College Students and the National Anthem.

*Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that in consequence of the disorderly conduct of some graduates and undergraduates at the conferring of degrees on October 27th last, whereby the singing of the National Anthem was forcibly prevented, he Senate of the Royal University of Ireland passed a resolution declaring the urgent necessity of obtaining powers to deal with all matters connected with the honour and discipline of the University; and whether the Government propose to take the necessary steps to give the Senate power to deal with cases of disloyal and disorderly conduct on the part of graduates and undergraduates of the Royal University.

Mr. BRYCE: I am advised that the Senate of the Royal University already possesses full power to maintain order at all meetings of the University, and to frame such statutes or rules as may be necessary for the purpose.

Longford Post Office.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that an Order has been issued by the local postmaster of Longford intimating that Longford post office is to be closed in future at 8 o'clock p.m., for sale of stamps; and whether, in view of the fact that up to two years ago this office was open for such sale till 10 o'clock each evening, and of the volume of business done at this office, and consequent inconvenience to the trade of the town this new regulation will cause, he will take steps to have it rescinded at once.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): It was found that comparatively little business was transacted at the Longford post office between 8 and 9 p.m., and instructions have therefore been issued for the office to be closed at 8 p.m., experimentally. The closing hour was changed from 10 p.m. to 9 p.m. in 1902, and it is believed that the public have suffered little or no inconvenience from the change. The usual closing hour for post offices in towns about the same size as Longford is 8 p.m.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Have any representations reached the right hon. Gentleman from the urban district council on that subject?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes.

Cloonagh and Granard Postal Delivery.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that an evening collection of letters between Cloonagh and Granard via Carrickduff has been recently refused by the Dublin postal authorities, on the ground that it was opposed by other people who do not live in the locality; and whether, as this change is desired by the people of the locality, he will direct that it be made.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have called for a report on this subject, and after its receipt I will acquaint the hon. Member with my decision.

North of Ireland Mail Service.

*Mr. LONDSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that most of the public and commercial bodies in the North of Ireland have petitioned for the establishment of a supplementary mail service daily to England viâ Greenore; and whether, in response to this demand, he will extend the privilege, already granted to Londonderry, to Armagh, Lurgan, Portadown, and other important towns in Ulster, as well as to the city of Belfast.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am aware that numerous applications have been received from the North of Ireland for the establishment of a supplementary mail service to England by way of Greenore. My predecessor was able to sanction such a service from Londonderry and Newry, but owing to the small amount of correspondence affected, it was not then practicable to afford the facilities to other towns. I will, however, have the subject again examined, with the view of ascertaining whether the circumstances have so changed as to allow me to establish additional despatches.

*MR. LONSDALE: Is it intended to go into the whole matter again? Commercial men in the North of Ireland are very much interested in this matter. Does the right hon. Gentleman intend to accept the decision of his predecessor?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am not bound by any decision of my predecessor. I intend making full inquiry myself.

The Post Office Inquiry.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question of which I have given private notice, viz., whether it is true that the Government has it in contemplation to appoint a Select Committee of the House to consider the wages of Post Office servants, and, if so, what will be the terms of reference.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is the case, as stated by the Postmaster-General in answer to a Question put by the hon. Member for Wansbeck yesterday, that the Government intend to appoint such a Select Committee. The terms of reference are under consideration.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Ordered, that the Proceedings on the Address in answer to His Majesty's Speech shall, until concluded, have precedence of all other Orders of the Day, and of Notices of Motions, at all Sittings for which they are set down.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of thirteen Members:—Sir John Brunner, Mr. Crombie, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Sir Joseph Leese, Colonel Long, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Mildmay, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. James Stuart, and Mr. D. A. Thomas were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.—(*Mr. William Redmond.*)

SELECTION.

Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Blake, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Fenwick, Sir Henry Aubrey-Fletcher, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Herbert Roberts, Mr Eugene Wason, Sir James Woodhouse and Mr. W. F. D. Smith were nominated Members of the Committee of Selection, together with the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders.—(*Mr. Fenwick.*)

NEW BILL.

METROPOLITAN POLICE PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, under The Metropolitan Police Act, 1886, relating to lands in the Borough of Deptford, and the Royal Borough of Kensington," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; supported by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 1.]

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament." — (*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said that when the House adjourned the previous night, he was giving an instance of the ferocity of the penal code in our services less than a century ago, in the case of a court-martial held on one Private John Cann, of the 95th Regiment (Rifle Brigade), at Paris, during its occupation by the victorious Allied Armies after the Waterloo campaign. The charge was one—

> "Of highly mutinous conduct, in drawing his rifle and threatening to shoot anyone who should attempt to take him into custody. And the opinion and sentence was that, the charge being proved, the court doth sentence the prisoner to receive a punishment of 1,000 lashes—which sentence His Grace the Commander-in-Chief has been graciously pleased to approve and confirm."

In these days we stood aghast at such a sentence, still more so when we heard that the victim was to receive 500 lashes, and then be taken down more dead than alive; to be cured in hospital, and then brought out to receive the remainder of the sentence! By successive steps and stages this ferocity had been mitigated, until flogging had practically ceased altogether in the Army, save only in military prisons, from which also he hoped to see it removed by this Parliament, and from the Navy, except to the extent to which his hon. friend had called attention. Now it was to be noted that every one of these steps had been vehemently opposed by the authorities as likely to be fatal to discipline, and ruinous to the service, and yet in every case they had proved to be fully justified and beneficial. One argument he would meet in advance. If they abolished the flogging of boys in the Navy they would be making one law for the poor and another for the rich—not in the sense in which it was usually quoted—but to the advantage of the poor. Eton and Harrow boys were flogged without being any the worse, and no one complained. He was not prepared to defend flogging in any shape, and if the two systems were alike or even comparable perhaps this Amendment might not have been moved. But whoever heard of an Eton or Harrow boy having to be watched by a doctor for hours after punishment for fear of bodily or mental consequences; or was it credible that the punishment of a comrade which was such as to induce his friend to attack the inflicter of it, regardless of consequences to himself, could have been anything short of maddening to the spectator? In his opinion, that boy was morally more deserving of honour and decoration than of twenty-four strokes and three months' imprisonment. He was made of the stuff from which heroic deeds spring, and might have done honour to his country in peace or war; whereas he would now probably leave the service at the earliest possible moment, bearing in his heart feelings of burning wrong and resentment. This was a new House, a new feeling pervaded it, and they confidently looked for a sympathetic answer from the Secretary to the Admiralty, which would justify his hon. friend in asking the House for leave to withdraw his Amendment, in which he should heartily concur.

Amendment proposed—

> "At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that, whereas the punishment of flogging has been abolished, with the happiest results, for upwards of a quarter of a century in Your Majesty's Army, men in Your Majesty's Navy are liable, under the provisions of the Naval Discipline Act, to floggings of twenty-five strokes of a cat-o'-nine-tails, which is a necessary equipment of every one of Your Majesty's ships, while boys and youths in Your Majesty's Navy, under eighteen years of age, are, by Your Majesty's Naval Regulations, for trivial offences, triable, not merely by courts-martial, but summarily liable to floggings "over the bare breech" of twenty-four lashes with birches 9 oz. in weight and steeped in brine, and to twelve strokes of a cane, such birchings and canings, which must be inflicted by the ship's police, in accordance with the Naval Regulations, "in the presence of all the boys" on board ship, being of frequent occurrence; and we further humbly represent that the retention of the system of flogging in Your Majesty's Navy is neither essential to the preservation of discipline, nor consonant with public opinion, and that the abolition by legislation of flogging in the Navy is urgently needed.' "—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee) deprecated bringing this matter forward as an Amendment to the Address, suggesting that a better opportunity of discussing it would have offered on the Navy Estimates. He would now, however, make the statement he had intended to make then, and he hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn after the hon.

Member for Donegal had heard the sympathetic reply which he was in a position to make on behalf of the Admiralty. The question was, as a matter of fact, dealt with by the Admiralty on January 30th last, a date implying an intelligent anticipation of events, in a circular addressed to the officers commanding squadrons, stations, and fleets. The circular, which was headed "Summary Punishments—Birching and Caning," ran as follows—

> "My Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, having had under their consideration the regulations governing the summary punishment of boys in the Royal Navy, have decided that the award of Punishment No. 20 Birching, as prescribed in Article 759 of the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions (Article 789 in the revised edition) shall be suspended, both for Boys and Youths under training, and for those serving afloat until further orders. At the expiration of twelve months a confidential report is to be forwarded by you as to the disciplinary effect of this order on the station under your command. My Lords further direct that punishment No. 21 Caning shall be inflicted only under the actual order of the captain of the ship, and that the regulations respecting the delegation of punishments to the executive officer shall be regarded as modified in this respect. The above decisions of Their Lordships are to be communicated by you confidentially to the commanding officers of His Majesty's ships and establishments under your command."

He hoped that his hon. friends would find his answer a sufficient justification for the withdrawal of the Amendment.

MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said he desired to express his thankfulness for the announcement they had just heard from the Secretary to the Admiralty. The constituency he represented would read it with great satisfaction, because there had, during the election been great dissatisfaction expressed on this question, and he was sure that all would be delighted at the prospect of the discontinuance of these practices.

CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds), who claimed indulgence as a new Member, remarked that he had some right to speak on this subject as he was the only naval officer on the Active List who had been returned to the present Parliament. This was entirely a naval question. Since he became a naval cadet in 1877, he had had personal knowledge of only two cases of birching in the Navy. The first was so long ago that he had forgotten the circumstances attending it, and the second one was the case of a boy who was birched for gross immorality. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment had mentioned the cat. He knew that there was a cat on board every ship, but that cat was there simply for a pattern of what a cat should be. It was there, not for use at all in time of peace, but as a pattern in case of a direct mutiny in time of war. It was kept solely for such contingencies, which they hoped might never occur. He had heard with great pain the manner in which the mover of the Amendment stated the birch was applied. The hon. Member had represented it to be a most awful instrument of torture, whereas the naval birch was lighter and shorter than the birch used ashore. It was only applied in very gross cases, and in his experience, extending from 1877, he had known it to be used on only two occasions. Only that day he was talking the matter over with a naval officer of two years' longer standing than himself and he said he had never seen a birching. The naval birch never had been pickled in brine. He was informed that morning, however, by a gentleman who had been himself treated with a birch pickled in brine that he suffered no ill effects; in fact it did him a great deal of good. He had seen his birch-rod picked from the hedge and watched the process of its manufacture up to the time when it was applied to his back. That gentleman now occupied a good position. The House of Commons could well leave this question of birching to the naval authorities, and not act in a grandmotherly way towards men who had spent their lives in the profession—the noblest in the world—by telling them whether they should cane a little boy or not. This was not, as the Member for Donegal alleged, a question of rich *versus* poor. Cadets in the Britannia were caned just the same as the boys in a training ship. [Cries of "Shame."] No, it was not a shame. It was a good thing for them. He could bring cases into the House, if hon. Members cared to see them, where he knew the boys actually benefited.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Did you ever get any yourself?

CAPTAIN HERVEY was not sure that he did not. Perhaps that was one of the reasons why he became a captain in the Navy at an earlier age than almost any one else; and perhaps that was also a reason why he was elected Member for Bury St. Edmunds. The hon. and gallant Gentleman proceeded to protest against the tone in which Mr. MacNeill spoke of officers who had been obliged to order this punishment in the Navy. These officers had been held up to the House as blood-thirsty ruffians who had stood by watching punishment which no humane, decent person would ever allow to be inflicted. It was not right that it should go forth to the world that our naval officers went back to pre-historic days when torture was rife. There was no torture in the matter at all. Naval officers did not mind pain and punishment as a deterrent, but they did not desire punishment to be made a form of terror. He was exceedingly sorry to hear that the hon. Member for South Donegal sent down to Suffolk a number of cartoons representing floggings of boys so as to keep out of that House a gentleman who was doing his best to obtain the answer just made by the present Secretary to the Admiralty. Just before the election a report was circulated to the effect that a boy had been flogged to death on the training ship stationed off Shotley, whereas the fact was that boy died of consumption and had had no punishment of any kind registered against him. The House should have an apology from the hon. Member for circulating such reports. Naval matters in his opinion should not be made Party matters. He apologised for intervening in the debate, but hoped the words of one who had seen what went on in the Navy would be of some use.

*MR. LEA (S. Pancras, E.) also asked for a patient hearing as he was a new Member of the House. The hon. Member for South Donegal, had, he said, done good service in exposing this blot on the Admiralty rules and regulations, which allowed caning and birching. He was, he believed, the only Member of this House who had served five years as a soldier in the ranks, and he doubted if there was any Member who knew what it was to be in the stokehold or lower deck of a man of war. It was all very well for the hon. Member who had just spoken, to take his views from the wardroom or the officers' mess. He himself had many and varied opportunities of ascertaining them, while he was in the service, and since, and he would assert that a British officer, either in the Army or the Navy, knew absolutely nothing of the atmosphere of the barrack room or lower deck. Therefore he hoped that hon. Members on both sides of the House would accept with a certain amount of discount the opinions expressed by the hon. and gallant Member for Bury St. Edmunds. Whatever the views of civilians might be with regard to the late Mr. Parnell, there was only one opinion of that great man in the barrack room. His mind went back to the year 1887, when he joined a famous regiment at Shorncliffe as a private soldier, and he had not been in the barrack room long before he learnt—as every recruit learned—of the flogging which went on in the old days, and of the debt of gratitude every British soldier owed to the once leader of a great historic Party for wiping out that hideous stain upon our Army. If hon. Members doubted that, let them go out into the street and ask the first old soldier they met—the first old commissionaire—if his memory carried him back to the day when the triangle was erected in the barrack square. The sight once seen could never be forgotten, and the old soldier would be able to describe some of the horrors which took place in those days. Yet the same sort of thing was still going on, not in the barrack square, it was true, but on the quarter-deck of His Majesty's ships. He approached this question in no Party spirit whatever, but he took absolute exception to the argument of the hon. Member who had just sat down when he declined to believe that this was a question of class. He was prepared to corroborate what the hon. Member for South Donegal had said. As regarded the naval and land forces, there were only two classes, the working class from which the rank and file were drawn, and the upper class from which the officers were drawn. It ought not to be forgotten that these men and boys in the Navy were voiceless upon this question, for they were not allowed to make their grievances public. It was useless to say that if they had any cause for complaint they could go to their orderly room, because that was a farce. If hon. Members had any doubt as to whether flogging ought to be abolished he would suggest an easy solution. Let hon. Members and the officials of the Admiralty the next time they had a case of flogging, save it up at Chatham, Devonport, or Portsmouth, and let all those who had any doubt go down and witness it. That would soon convert them. On what ground was the retention of flogging and birching defended ? It was said that it was necessary to maintain discipline. That he did not believe, because it was urged in the old days when the late Mr. Parnell did his best to get it abolished in the Army. He had yet to learn that discipline in the Army was in a worse state than it was twenty-five or thirty years ago. There were men in the Navy who absolutely abhorred this kind of thing, and even Captain Marryat wrote in favour of its abolition almost 100 years ago. What were the crimes for which flogging was considered necessary ? If they were so serious as to deserve flogging, then those men who had committed them once and undergone a fitting punishment were no longer worthy to wear His Majesty's uniform either as boys or men, and they should be treated as criminals and turned out of the service to which they were no longer worthy to belong. Soldiers and sailors realised that there was a certain amount of dignity attached to the uniform they wore, and they hated flogging for they did not like a sword of Damocles always hanging over their heads. It was a great mistake to suppose that the men in the Navy had not a lively sense of what was going on, and in their hearts they thanked the hon. Member for South Donegal for the great trouble he had taken in the matter. They had heard a lot about cruelties on the Rand, but he had yet to learn that they could treat their own flesh and blood in this way with impunity, because these men sprang from the working classes in towns and villages. Times had changed, and men had changed with them. A great majority had been sent here to support their honoured Prime Minister in the hope that social grievances were to be redressed, and great reforms to be carried through, and he ventured to suggest that one of the happiest preludes to those reforms would be the abolition of a form of punishment which was a disgrace to our ideas of humanity.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): There is an old proverb which says that it is unnecessary to push an open door, yet it is in some such process that I think we are now engaged. I do not regret that the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has paid no attention to that proverb, because the result is that he has, at any rate, made a very interesting speech. At the same time, I would point out that his speech is directed to a state of things which is rather of the past. Taking the particular state of things with which we are now dealing, it certainly is different from that with which we dealt at the time when flogging in the Army was abolished; and I would desire that in the present state of things we should endeavour to avoid all exaggeration, especially that kind of exaggeration which must give great pain to a noble profession. I think great credit is due to the hon. Member for South Donegal for raising this question, and I sympathise with him in so doing. Although the hon. Gentleman began by saying that this was in no sense a political question, I am afraid he has not always treated it as though it were non-political. I am afraid the hon. Gentleman has been, as enthusiasts are apt to be, a little too much inclined to take for gospel all the stories of grievance which come to anyone who undertakes to deal with a matter of this kind. I am sure we are all agreed that the officers of the British Navy, speaking of them as a class, would naturally and rightly resent the imputation of cruelty or of the infliction of pain for the sake of inflicting pain. I think we shall all be inclined to agree with the statement that the infliction of this punishment has been comparatively rare. But, having said that, I congratulate the Secretary to the Admiralty upon the decision which has been arrived at. I understand from what has fallen from my hon. and gallant friend that Mr. Pretyman, the late Secretary to the Admiralty, was engaged in bringing the matter before his naval colleagues when the change of Government took place, and the result accordingly would have been the same. I think the House might accept the decision in the form in which it has been presented. The practice of birching has been suspended for twelve months, and I hope and believe it will never be re-established. At the time when Mr. Parnell raised this question on the Army Discipline Act, I was one of the very few Members who heartily supported him. For, in the first instance, many persons who sympathised with Mr. Parnell's action in the matter were deterred from supporting him owing to his policy of obstruction. In regard to flogging I have personally always taken the strongest possible line. It is a punishment which I hate and detest in all its forms and upon almost every conceivable occasion. The only exception I would make is in the case of certain offences against women and children. Then I am ready that the offenders should be flogged as brutes. I hate the flogging of boys at public schools; and although I have had boys of my own at public schools, I always took care that in no conceivable circumstances should they be subjected to this humiliation, and I venture to say that they have not proved in after-life any the worse on that account. In the case where flogging is applied as a punishment in connection with the Service, or in similar ways, I am perfectly ready to admit that the great majority of people who are entrusted with this power do not abuse it; but there always will be men who do abuse it, and it is to prevent the abuse which is possible that we must direct our legislation. I had a great deal to do with this question when I was Secretary of State for the Colonies. Let the House know that wherever we have to deal with coloured populations the punishment of flogging is in existence. I was not able to prevent it; but I did take steps, as is well known, to limit and reduce it, and to prevent its extension. I found confirmation of my prejudice against this method of punishment in the facts which I obtained. I required Returns to be made which had never been made before as to the amount and state of flogging in the Colonies, and I found that in the same colony two magistrates acting almost side by side would make a totally different Return. One magistrate would administer a large district without ever applying this punishment, while in the next district another magistrate would consider it a common necessity. That points to the difficulty that you cannot depend on your instruments. Another difficulty is the extreme inequality of the punishment, the nature of which depends on the way in which it is executed. Executed by a particular officer it may, owing to his strength or his character, become much more severe than it would be if a more humane or weaker person were entrusted with it. Again, one man would order the maximum of lashes, while another would think that justice was satisfied by a very much smaller number. I apologise to the House for what is perhaps too personal. I thoroughly sympathise at all events with the object of the hon. Member for South Donegal, and wish to say how glad I am to find that the Admiralty, without any fear of injuring discipline in the Navy under their charge, are able to consent to this experimental suspension, being absolutely convinced, as I am, that once suspended it will not be re-imposed.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the new order would have the effect of putting down public flogging. He gathered that under the old rule a boy was not only caned, when subjected to punishment, but that the other boys were compelled to witness the punishment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said there was nothing in the circular dealing with that matter. He suggested that the hon. Member should give notice of a Question on the subject.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he would suggest to the hon. Member for South Donegal that he should withdraw the Amendment. He had not got all that he asked for, but he had made a step in the direction of the complete abolition of flogging. He expressed gratification that the part which Mr. Parnell played in the abolition of flogging in the Army was still gratefully remembered by British soldiers. He remembered how when his hon. friend first raised the question he was almost howled down. There would always be on the part of the Irish Party a desire to support the cause of common humanity in any part of the world. He felt that they had a very proud record in this House in that respect. His hon. friend who initiated this most interesting debate pointed out that they were supported by Mr. Wilberforce when an Irishman first introduced the proposal for the abolition of slavery. The legislation for the protection of animals from cruelty was proposed by an Irishman, and the measure dealing with that matter was known as Martin's Act. It was an Irishman who abolished the flogging of soldiers, and it was now an Irishman who had abolished the flogging of sailors. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who opposed the Amendment spoke about the honour of the British Navy, and they listened to him with a certain amount of sympathy. But the same kind of language, almost the same words, were heard twenty-six years ago when it was proposed to abolish flogging in the Army. It was said that it was impossible to attribute these cruelties to British officers, but the fact remained that the system was bad. There was no getting over the fact that where they had a cruel and bad system human nature was so weak that men would be brutalised by the system. He thought that the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would sink deep into the mind of the House, for he had pointed out by a peculiarly strong illustration the evils of the system. The right hon. Gentleman had made inquiry into the working of the system in the Colonies, and found that in the case of magistrates working side by side, one man could preserve order without the punishment of flogging while the other sometimes imposed it. The House was now practically unanimous on this question, and he congratulated his hon. friend the Member for South Donegal on the change which had been brought about on this subject.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I wish to take the opportunity of associating myself with what has been said, as to what we owe to my hon. friend the Member for South Donegal. I well remember the opposition which my hon friend encountered when he first brought this matter forward, and also the courage and pertinacity he showed in insisting upon his views being fully expressed, a pertinacity and courage which have ended in his success to-day. I think, as the right hon. Gentleman said, that we have all been pushing an open door, because the statement made by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty shows that among the Board of Admiralty itself, as well as among the present political members of that Board, the case has been fully recognised that the discipline of the Navy ought to be maintainable, and could be maintained, without resort to these degrading practices, which are really a relic of older and worse days. I think we cannot select one to whom praise is more distinctly due than the hon. Member for South Donegal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL expressed his grateful acknowledgments to the Prime Minister and to the House, and asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) moved an Amendment declaring that large numbers of loyal subjects in Ireland view with alarm the statement in His Majesty's Speech in regard to changes in the system of government in Ireland. He said that this was not the first time he had had the honour to address the House of Commons on the question of Irish government. There were certain features in the present situation which differentiated it from any other occasion. When he read in the papers the result of the last election he realised that there would be an immense majority practically pledged to Home Rule. He thought the hon. Member for Waterford would have an easy job in bringing Home Rule triumphantly to the front in the House of Commons. When he read the King's Speech he asked what had happened to Home Rule. Other measures appeared to have usurped its place. But there was no question which so deeply interested all shades of opinion in Ireland as Home Rule. When he saw the few vague sentences in the King's Speech he said to himself that there must be something behind them, for the hon. Member for Waterford could not remain satisfied for a moment with a simple statement of that kind. He had known the hon. Member for Waterford for a number of years, and he was certain that the hon. Member was absolutely in earnest in regard to Home Rule. He knew that the Prime Minister had over and over again openly and without the slightest reservation declared that he was a Home Ruler. But the right hon. Gentleman gave the Nationalist Members very good advice. He did not for a moment cast the shadow of doubt on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that there was no contract between himself and the hon.

Member for Waterford. But without a contract he might give friendly advice. Undoubtedly, in that celebrated speech at Stirling—the only speech delivered during the late great election in which the right hon. Gentleman was drawn on the question of Home Rule —[MINISTERIAL cries of "No, No!"]—he might be making a mistake; he believed that there might have been a case of "heckling"—at any rate in the Stirling speech the right hon. Gentleman gave some fatherly advice—[MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"]—well, friendly advice on Home Rule in general, and very wise advice it was. The right hon. Gentleman said that it was a physical impossibility to bring in a Home Rule Bill this session. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen were so infatuated in favour of Home Rule that they did not look to the Prime Minister to bring in a Home Rule Bill for the present! But the right hon. Gentleman gave this advice—

> "If you cannot have a Home Rule Bill, you should take any measure which lends itself to, and leads up to, Home Rule."

It required a Scotsman to give that advice. He had no doubt that that advice of the right hon. Gentleman was eminently a wise advice. He took it that the hon. Member for Waterford and his followers had accepted that advice and that they were going to follow it—for the present. The prospect held out by the right hon. Gentleman was of some measure, at some time, which would bring the Irish people more in harmony with the legislation for their country. That was the sort of line which the hon. Member for Waterford should take. He did not know whether that satisfied the hon. Member for Waterford, but he doubted very much if it would satisfy him if it did not mean more than it said. The main object he had—it would be easily understood, for he generally talked with plainness—was that of trying to draw some opinion from some Member of the Government—perhaps the Prime Mnister—although he might be too lowly a personage to draw him—as to what they did mean by this legislation and when were they going to bring it in. They had had various amateur attempts in regard to legislation in Ireland with reference to devolution, which were scouted by the hon. Member for Waterford. He was perfectly sure that the hon. Gentleman would not himself accept as a satisfactory solution of that problem the proposals in the King's Speech. What did these mean? They meant, he supposed, some electoral body, some body to be created in Ireland to carry on Irish legislation of a kind. They did not know what legislation. He concluded that the police would be given into their charge and that there would be other descriptions of legislation. That was to satisfy the hon. Member for Waterford—for the time. [OPPOSITION laughter.] What was the objection they had to this? It was very easy to put it before the House. Why should they object to the establishment in Ireland of a body elected by the Irish people to deal with Irish affairs? But who were the Irish people? He ventured to say that he belonged to the Irish nation as much as any one of the Nationalist Members. The hon. Member for Waterford and his friends might say that afternoon, "Look at the illustration we give you as to how absolutely we are devoid of prejudice! Look at the way we managed the Local Government Board! There is only one Catholic elected to it!" The fact remained that the hon. Gentleman could not get out of the difficulty of the Local Government Board which furnished a good specimen of how elected bodies would be constituted in Ireland. Except in two or three counties in Ireland, or perhaps four, there had been made a clean sweep of all Protestants and Unionists. Well, the exception proved the rule. The House would thus understand why he, speaking in the name of Irish Unionists, distinctly said that any Bill brought in by the Government which gave to an elected body in Ireland power to make Irish laws to deal with Irish affairs was one which Unionists would repudiate, knowing as they did that they would never have a voice on that body which would enable them to effect what they believed to be their duty. The hon. Member for Waterford made a very admirable and eloquent speech the other night dealing with the whole question. He implied that he was so satisfied with the promises contained in the King's Speech that he and his friends intended, for the first time in history, to give the Government an easy time. He did not know how Nationalist Members would go on. He did not know anything more appalling than to imagine eighty eloquent Irishmen staring at the Treasury Bench and holding their tongues! The hon. Member for Waterford went on to give a most lamentable description of Ireland. He did not know what part of Ireland the hon. Member lived in. It must be a most disastrous spot. Because his experience of Ireland, which was longer than the experience of the hon. Member for Waterford, was that there was no country that he knew which had made more progress. The hon. Member for Waterford gave figures which were meant to show that in Ireland there were declining trade and various other things; and that all this was the fault of the British Parliament. And the inference was that an Irish Parliament would soon remedy all this. How would Home Rule change the matter of the increase of lunatics and idiots in Ireland? He wanted something definite and concrete from the hon. Gentleman. How would Home Rule make Ireland richer and better than it was. The hon. Member for Waterford went on to say that the birth rate was decreasing and inferred that if Home Rule were granted babies would be springing up all over Ireland. How could they estimate whether Ireland was going back or forward? He would give some figures. The Post Office Savings bank was an indication as to the amount of money in Ireland. In 1895 there were sums amounting to £5,337,000 in the Irish Post Office Savings Bank, while in 1905 the sums amounted to £10,737,000. That showed that Ireland was not going back. The joint stock banks which represented the middle and commercial classes in Ireland had deposited in them in 1895 sums amounting to £37,497,000, and in 1905 sums amouning to £44,990,000. He maintained that that was an indication, at any rate, that Ireland was not going back in point of wealth. He would like to hear a logical contradiction of these figures. Besides that, his memory went back forty years, and the whole condition of the people was infinitely better than it used to be. 180,000 Irish farmers now owned their land. Was that nothing? The dress of the people, the food of people, the whole social attitude of the people had to his mind infinitely improved in the last twenty years. He would like Nationalist Members who talked about "the miserable little isle" to listen to this. Ireland was not hopeless as a country. Ireland had had advantages which no other part of the British Empire had had. That House—that tyrannical assembly—had given Ireland a large sum of money. The other day the hon. Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool went to Belfast to the Ulster Hall.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: You would not get a hearing.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: That is quite true. Hon. Gentlemen below the gangway have a way of dealing with traitors which we have not. [A Nationalist Member: Is that meant for Sloan?] They went to Belfast and the hon. Member for Waterford made an eloquent speech, and the hon. Member for the Scotland Division made a speech of unparalleled pathos. He described Ireland as a wretched, miserable, poverty-stricken island which was tyrannised over by the House of Commons and had the heel of the British Sovereign on its neck. The hon. Member ought to have said that it was not the weight of one British sovereign it had to bear, but that of 140 millions of British sovereigns. What part of the British Empire had ever been treated in the way that Ireland had? He wondered what Scotland would say if they only had the chance of such a shower of gold as Ireland had had. He wondered what Wales would say, or even England. What other part of the British Empire had ever received from the House a gift of over 100 millions of money. He wondered when the Home Rule Parliament came into operation where they would get the funds to supplement those gifts of the British House of Commons? He was afraid he was delaying the House. ["No, no!"]

MR. DILLON: Why you have not come to the subject yet.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said he would now come to the subject, at all events. One of the objects he had in moving the Amendment was to show the invincible objection which Irish Unionists had to the establishment of a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland. He would explain by an illustration what he meant. In Ireland they had not only to deal with the Nationalist Party. Sometimes they were hard to deal with, but they did not stand alone. There was an election held in North Louth, and what occurred there exactly illustrated what he intended to convey to the House. He was sure he expressed the feelings of both sides of the House when he said how glad he was to see the Member for North Louth back. The hon. Member for Waterford did not look upon the election in that light. But he knew nothing of the reasons why these hon. Gentlemen had not got on well during the last six years. It happened that it was determined by the hon. Member for Waterford that the present Member for North Louth should vanish from the scene. He was an opponent, and injurious to their cause, as the hon. Gentleman said, whether in Parliament or out of it. But the hon. Member for North Louth was a very courageous man, and they in Ireland looked forward to one of the most amusing elections that ever happened in Ireland. The campaign was started by the parish priest, the Rev. Father Quinn, who made a very eloquent speech, but the language was so strong that even he would not dare to use it in that House. He said that he knew all the Nationalist Members, and he divided his abuse among them pretty equally in terms that he (the speaker) would not care to reproduce. Then the hon. Member for North Louth started also in very good form, and among other things he made a notable remark. He said that his opponents had not as much sense as would conduct a drake to a hen-house. He believed that by the drake the hon. Member meant the hon. Member for Waterford, and by the hen-house a Parliament at College Green where Irishmen could cackle to all eternity. And then a change came over the spirit of the scene. The hon. Member for Waterford was prepared if possible to oust the Member for North Louth. Then Cardinal Logue wrote to say he was extremely sorry that he had written to that effect. Then another archbishop came on the scene, Archbishop Walsh, and that proved a clincher. The combination of two archbishops absolutely flattened out the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member for Waterford wrote a letter, in which he said that although his opinion had not changed about the hon. Member for North Louth, still, in consequence of the fact that the archbishop had written he withdrew his opposition. Now, what was the lesson to anybody who read these things? When he said in the House that Home Rule meant Rome Rule he was simply put down as an Orange bigot. But here they had the thing proved to the hilt by the hon. Member for Waterford, and he said that the Nonconformists in this House ought to take the incident to heart and ask themselves whether they as Protestants would consent to hand over the Irish loyalists to the authority of those archbishops and priests. He did not know how the hon. Member for Waterford would proceed to carry on the war. He admired the success which the hon. Member had achieved up to the present. He remembered that the hon. Member for Waterford said in this House that if he could employ force he would use it. But he had not the money to buy breech-loading artillery, and he had to put up with the weapons he found to his hand—eighty-two Irish muzzle-loaders, loaded at high presure with oratorical gas, whom the hon. Member had under perfect control, and which he could aim at the unhappy denizens of the Treasury bench, at whom he fired the first shot the day before last. Whether he made a bull's eye he did not know. Whether he hit the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in a tender place they would probably know when he made his speech. But whatever he did, he was confronted in Ireland by an opposition which was absolutely united in opposing his aims, and which he might find in the end was too strong even for him if any attempt were made in the future to hand over the Irish loyalists of a l denominations to a power which their forefathers would not serve, and which the Unionist Party of to-day would never consent to obey.

Mr. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) seconded the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend. The Unionist minority in Ireland were vitally interested in this question, and they were entitled to know the meaning of the language used with reference to Ireland in the gracious Speech from the Throne. The Unionists were the people who would suffer first from any change in the system of government in Ireland, and they were entitled to know what their position would be and what was really meant by the statement—

"Plans are under consideration for introducing into the system of government in Ireland, means for associating the people in the conduct of Irish affairs."

What were those means, and how were they to differ from the means which existed with regard to the association of the people in the conduct of affairs in England or Scotland? If they meant the same thing, let it be told to the House. If they meant something different, let that be explained. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had said that this language might mean very little, or it might mean a great deal, and the hon. and learned Member was content for the present to say nothing, and to wait in the belief—which perhaps was not quite unfounded—that those words did mean a great deal, and he intended therefore, to let the Government have a free hand to develop them. But in the meantime, the hon. and learned Member for Waterford told them that he would have nothing but a separate Parliament for Ireland. Was that what was intended by this language? If it was, ought not the country to know it at once? Surely it was not too much to expect right hon. Gentlemen—who came into power without putting that at all events as one of the issues to the electors, but stating at the time that this Parliament would not deal with Home Rule, and in many cases knowing that if the Government had said it was going to give Home Rule to Ireland they would have lost the election—surely it was too much to expect that the Government would say what they intended to do in this matter. If the hon. Member for Waterford was right in believing that this was one of those instalments which was to lead up to the larger policy spoken of by the Prime Minister at Stirling, the country was entitled to know it. They knew very well that, ever since Home Rule was brought prominently before the country twenty-one years ago, on every occasion when the country had had the opportunity of expressing a definite opinion on the subject, they had expressed it definitely against an Irish Parliament and Home Rule. Was it now to be said, without consulting the constituencies, that we were to have Home Rule either by one measure or in instalments but under other names than that by which it had been known? Surely the Irish Unionists who were more vitally interested than anyone else, who were the law abiding and industrious people of Ireland, who had every reason to believe that such a change would be disastrous to them and their liberty, ought to know at the earliest possible moment what the Government meant if they did not mean Home Rule by the statement in the King's Speech—

"We have plans under consideration for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs."

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: What comes before that?

Mr. GORDON: I will read it—

"My Ministers have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies."

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Exactly; what do you object to?

Mr. GORDON said the hon. Member for South Tyrone could not change the language of the King's Speech, which went on to say, "and for introducing into it (*i.e.*, the government of Ireland) means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs." [Cheers.] He understood those cheers perfectly well. Those who cheered understood what the words meant. So did Unionists. They asked in what way it was proposed to associate the people with the management of affairs differently from that which existed in England or Scotland? In Ireland at present there were county councils, district councils, and poor law guardians, all elected by the people, and all in exactly the same position as similar bodies in England and Scotland. What change was now to be made in reference to them? Was the Local Government Board to be got rid of? Was all supervision over the actions of county and district councils and poor law guardians to be revoked in Ireland and continued in England? If so, why? This vague language might convey a wished-for meaning to the hon. Member for Waterford, but to the Unionists it suggested a meaning which they feared, and which, if given effect to, would bring disaster on the country. If these proposals were to be reduced to a scheme of Private Bill legislation he did not think there was an Irish Member who would say a word against it. The only two things in which the people of Ireland were not associated with the management of Irish affairs in precisely the same way as in England and Scotland were primary education and the police. Was the Chief Secretary going to put primary education in Ireland in the hands of the county councils? Surely to do that would be to betray ignorance of the wishes and feelings of the Irish people, and arouse the utmost contention. Would the Chief Secretary undertake the responsibility of putting the management of the police into the hands of the county councils? If he did he must be prepared for a very short term of office and the sacrifice of his reputation for good sound commonsense and foresight. If the Chief Secretary could economise without any sacrifice of efficiency no one would object, but all the boards in Ireland were under the Chief Secretary. Was he going to divest himself of responsibility for their actions? He would call attention to two or three statements which would go to show that the Government had committed themselves. In the first place, he would point out that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, in moving an Amendment to the Address last session, said—

> "The system of government in Ireland is in opposition to the wishes of the Irish people, and gives them no voice in the management of their own affairs."

What did he mean and intend by that Amendment, which received the votes of the Prime Minister and his supporters? The hon. and learned Member meant the same thing as was imported in the King's Speech now. What other statement was there which was well calculated to fill them with alarm although it gave delight and pleasure to the Nationalist Members? The Prime Minister stated in the House in April last—

> "The principle of self-government—the principle of an elective element that shall be a governing element in Ireland—remains in our view the only principle consonant with our constitutional habits and practices, and, what is more, the only principle that will ever work."

How was the right hon. Gentleman going to work this new principle in the King's Speech? He said that the only principle that would ever work in Ireland was the principle of self-government. Let the House have an explanation now of what he meant and how he was going to work this matter if it were different from what he referred to in April last. Again, the right hon. Gentleman said in his Stirling speech—

> "His desire was to see an effective control of Irish affairs in the hands of a representative Irish authority, and he therefore thought that, if he were an Irish Nationalist he would take it in any way he could get it."

Was this giving it in one of the ways the right hon. Gentleman suggested the Nationalists should take it? There was no doubt or ambiguity in the language which he used, namely, that what he desired to see was the effective control of Irish affairs placed in the hands of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman proceeded to say that he would advise Nationalists to accept something which was consistent with, and would lead up to, the larger policy. That larger policy was Home Rule, and let there not be any mistake about it. He had heard the Prime Minister state over and over again in the House for the last twenty years that he was in favour of Home Rule, that his opinions had never changed, and that as he grew older he had become more and more convinced of the correctness of his opinions.. He was not alone in these matters. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated in October last that neither he nor any Liberal had ever gone back from the aims of Mr. Gladstone's policy; he said he was as perfectly convinced as ever that the present system of government in Ireland was irrational and unworkable. During the election the question was kept in the background as much as possible. When it was put straight before the electors, they expressed an opinion diametrically opposed to it. Now that there was a Radical majority in the House, there was to be an instalment of something which was to be consistent with and lead up to the larger policy of Home Rule. The Secretary of State for India and the Postmaster-General had also made statements to the same effect. These were statements about which there could be no mistake and no misapprehension. They were made by responsible members of the Government. and now that there was a Parliament elected not on that issue at all, one of the first things they were about to put before the House was an instalment of Home Rule. There was no doubt what the view of the Nationalists was about this matter. The *Freeman's Journal* had stated that every vote given to a follower of the Prime Minister was a vote given for Home Rule. That was apparently underlying the statement in the King's Speech. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford was only willing to accept it because he believed that, if he was not going to get everything at once, he was, at any rate, going to get a substantial instalment. If it was a system of devolution it would not be accepted by him, because that was not what he and his followers wanted. With reference to the state of affairs in Ireland, the Nationalist Members were there in large numbers, but after all they and the people whom Unionist Members represented lived in the same country and under the same laws. The Unionist people had not the same advantages of climate or situation that the south enjoyed. The south and central parts were far more fertile and far better adapted to agriculture. If Ireland had been overtaxed the people he represented had borne more than their share of the burden. They had made the part of the country in which they lived prosperous and law-abiding. They had created a great city which had trebled its population in the last forty years and had far more than doubled its shipping and its revenues. These people did not ask for Home Rule. They did not ask for the things which were suggested in the King's Speech, whatever they were. He thought it would have been better to set them out in black and white so that everyone could see what was meant. These people said that those in the rest of Ireland who had not made the best use of their opportunities wanted to get the control over the Unionists of the country. If Home Rule were given to Ireland, their property, their industries, and their freedom would be endangered. Why should it be given when the most industrious, the most loyal, the most law-abiding parts of the country did not want it? If the rest of the country were as loyal, as industrious, and as law-abiding there would be no question of Home Rule. Why should it be forced on these people in the north who had always feared the introduction of any of those things which the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet had stated they so devoutly desired?

The Liberals thought they would try a far more insidious and dangerous method of arriving at the same result, viz., that of instalments, which they thought would not attract the attention of the public in the same manner as a Bill for Home Rule. If they had a repetition of this year after year they would find that at the end of the life of this Parliament Ireland would have Home Rule, which was about the last thing the British people thought they were helping to bring about when they returned the Liberals to power. They had great reason for apprehension in everything that had been said by prominent members of the Government on the question, and feeling, as he and his colleagues did, the injustice and injury it would inflict upon them they would have been wanting in their duty if they had not challenged the Government to let the country know what they meant by this language, which was described as vague by the uninitiated, but which to the initiated was as clear as noon-day.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that large numbers of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Ireland view with alarm the statement that Your Majesty's Ministers have under consideration proposals to effect changes in the system of government in Ireland, believing that Your Majesty's present advisers by their past declarations have committed themselves to a policy which will endanger the liberties and property of the loyalist minority, promote discord and civil strife, and impair the integrity of the United Kingdom.' "—(*Colónel Saunderson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he rejoiced to know that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had in his speech the other night been able to reach the intellect and conscience of so many new Members of that House. He would have rejoiced if on this occasion there had been a full house to hear the other side of the question from the lips of the two political brands who had been plucked from the burning in Ulster. He was sorry to hear the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh in such bad form. Even the old jokes did not do duty on this occasion. The presence of all the ex-Cabinet Ministers even did not seem to inspire him. When the House of Commons discussed Chinese labour or the unemployed question, there was only one ex-Cabinet Minister present, but the moment the question of Ireland was raised, and there was a chance of striking a blow at the welfare and prosperity of Ireland, then the whole force of ex-Cabinet Ministers was rallied to the House to stay the march of progress. [Mr. WYNDHAM at this stage left the Front Opposition Bench.] This was not the first time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had run away. The right hon. Gentleman started a policy of conciliation, and the moment it became practicable he was hunted out by the Unionists from the north of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, his successor, was the strong man, the Sandow of British politics in relation to Ireland, the gentleman with such gigantic genius, intellectual capacity, and splendid public spirit, who, when Bristol would not have him, came over to be the representative of the lodgers of South Dublin. It only showed what a chivalrous race the Irish were, when the offscourings of Bristol——[Cries of "Shame" from the OPPOSITION Benches.]

*MR. SPEAKER: If that observation is applied to the right hon. Gentleman, it ought to be withdrawn.

MR. JOSEPH DELVIN said he did not use it in a personal sense at all, but purely in a political sense. He thought, he said, the Irish were a very chivalrous race to allow the right hon. Gentleman to enter the House through an Irish constituency after he had hunted all round England in vain to find a philanthropic Tory to make room for him, and even then he got in by the merest fluke. He wished to say a few words in reply to the speeches which had just been delivered from the Opposition Benches. The terrors of Home Rule had been depicted, and they had heard how the loyal minority would suffer under it. They had been told that he had himself been returned by a majority of sixteen, but he would remind the House that the hon. Member for South Londonderry in a permanently Unionist constituency was elected by a majority of only seventy.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): A seat formerly held by the Nationalists.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said it was twenty years since the seat was held by a Nationalist. If the House could understand—as the Member for South Tyrone could explain—the methods and the influences which were brought into play by this representative of law, order, freedom, and liberty all the world over, and by this high constitutional Chancery lawyer, who was somewhat disappointed, they would realise what the majority of seventy meant. It had been said that the question of Home Rule had been kept in the background in England. However true that might be in England, Home Rule was not kept in the background in Ireland, and yet the Irish Nationalist Party came back to this House stronger than they left it, and with the people of Ireland more convinced than ever of the irresistible justice of their cause. The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh claimed to be an Irishman, but it was an extraordinary circumstance that he had never risen in this House to plead for right against wrong, or to appeal for justice for the wretched people in those parts of Ireland where they suffered from landlordism and poverty, and he had never even spoken for the workers of the North of Ireland. He had never pleaded for either Protestant or Catholic workers, and he was, in fact, a representative of the worst form of reaction in the world. For twenty-five years the right hon. and gallant Member had done his best to stand with his little band of loyal men—loyal to themselves.

The right hon. and gallant Gentleman was once a Radical, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. There was nothing worse than a converted Radical. They could never arrest his march into the camp of reaction, and when he got into the camp of reaction he was the greatest reactionist there. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been a Tory leader off and on for twenty-five years. The right hon. Gentleman had talked of progress in Ireland. He challenged him to say what he had done for progress in twenty-five years. What had he done during the passage of the legislation of the last twenty-five years? Was he not on every occasion the chief instrument to stay that progress, to prevent the fruition of the hopes even of honest British statesmen, and to put every obstacle in the way of every advantage which even honest men in England desired to offer to the Irish people? And then the right hon. Gentleman came here and said he was just as good an Irishman as the Nationalists.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I deny the statement.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he stood on the record of the right hon. Gentleman's public life. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had supported some things. He had supported coercion. His humour never was finer than when he was dancing clown-like upon the corpses of the Irish people. He never seemed to be so merry as when he was working out a chain to bind them and bear them down, and putting on their shoulders those laws which had been denounced, and rightly denounced, as measures of repression and obstacles of reform. He had once more raised the Protestant cry. This was largely a Nonconformist House, and the right hon. Gentleman wanted to impress upon the virgin minds of the Nonconformists of this House what a frightful nation of bigots the Irish were, how they tortured Protestants, how they prevented them from enjoying any of the liberties which citizens ought to enjoy. He would not mind the attack, although it was unjustified, if it were made by a man who did not live in a glass house, but there never was anyone who lived in a more perfect glass house in this regard than the right hon. Gentleman. In the Nationalist Party in this House there were Protestant Members for Fermanagh, Longford, King's County, Cavan, Cork (two members) and Donegal. Cork, Cavan and Donegal were three of the most Catholic counties in Ireland, and he ventured to say that if there was a conflict between Protestant and Catholic on a purely theological question the Protestant would not get 300 votes in any of those constituencies. These counties had returned to Parliament some of the best and ablest of the Nationalist Members, and he was proud they had been returned. They were affectionately regarded by their colleagues, for they knew no religious divisions in the Nationalist Party. What was the character of the representation of those high-minded gentlemen who impeached their own nation? There were sixteen of them, and there was not a single Catholic among them.

MR. DILLON: And never was.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG: May I call the attention of the hon. Member to the case of Mr. Denis Henry.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: That is perfectly true. They offered him a Catholic seat which he had not the ghost of a chance of winning.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG rose again and was received with cries of "Order."

*MR. SPEAKER: Unless it is to make some personal explanation the hon. Gentleman has no right to interrupt.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he always gave way to the hon. Gentleman, because he knew that it was always in his own interest to do so. The hon. Member had referred to the case of Mr. Denis Henry to show that they were not bigots. His own view was that Mr. Henry was not a Catholic, but he was not going to contradict the statement that he was. They put him up for a seat which was formerly occupied by an honoured Member of this House. What was the result? That the constituency returned to the House one of the most distinguished lawyers in Ireland—a Protestant. One of the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman was that Ireland was not a wretched little island with a people miserable and starving. The Nationalists had never made the statement that it was. What they said and maintained was that there never was an island on God's earth more bountifully endowed with all the munificence that an all-wise and gracious Providence could bestow. By the system of landlordism, which the right hon. Gentleman stood for, that beautiful island had been reduced to the state so eloquently described two days ago by his hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the amount of the deposits in the savings banks. If they had plenty of money in Ireland why was the right hon. Gentleman present at the meeting which was held for the purpose of denouncing the robbery of Ireland by the Imperial Exchequer? The right hon. and gallant Member was one of the orators of what was known as the Financial Relations Association. A Royal Commission, composed largely of Englishmen, decided that Ireland had been charged to the extent of £3,500,000 every year since the Union beyond her taxable capacity. The right hon. Gentleman agreed with that. The right hon. Gentleman was one of the most eloquent denouncers of this grave fiscal wrong. The population of Ireland had decreased by half during the last fifty years; the land was going out of cultivation; the people were flying to America; and the birth rate was decreasing. That was no joke. It was impossible to have an increasing population if the youth of the country, the young men and women, were leaving. If from a little country like Ireland £3,500,000 had been robbed each year over and above what it was entitled to pay to the Imperial Exchequer, surely that country could not be financially very strong, and how could it promote great social and vital reforms if it had not the money necessary. The right hon. Gentleman came to the House thinking that it was the same old House with Ministerial Benches closely packed behind to listen to his many tales and grotesque romances about Irish wealth. But he had a different House to deal with now. The House, whatever its other limitations, was at least ready to listen to truth and justice. He asked the House to listen to none of the slanders uttered by anti-Irishmen in order that they might build up their position at the expense of the impoverishment of their own people. With regard to the Amendment, he noticed something sinister about it. His own opinion was that it was a Brummagem Amendment. Since Mr. Moore was lost to the Tory Party there was not one of them who could draft an Amendment. He believed they could have got Mr. Balfour to frame an Amendment, for he was not very busy just now; but the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh thought a half-sheet of note-paper would not be large enough. Therefore, the wisdom of Birmingham, which was largely responsible for the present position of the Tory Party, had been brought into operation, and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had drafted the Amendment. He noticed a great deal of anxiety in the Amendment for "life, liberty and property." Was it not rather a strange irony coming from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham—a gentleman who was so anxious for "life, liberty and property," in Ireland, that he drenched South Africa with blood in order to satisfy the German Jews in the Transvaal, and was responsible for the loss of £250,000,000 of British money, and the sacrifice of 25,000 British subjects in the War. They had also heard about loyalty. Anyone who listened to the right hon. Member for North Armagh would have imagined that his whole passion in life was to give voluntary service to the Empire. They on that side of the House were said to be demagogues, but the Ulster Members were high-minded, public-spirted gentlemen. And would they believe that out of eighteen of them seven occupied well-paid positions in Ireland. The Marquis of Hamilton had £1,200 a year, and his predecessor in the representation of West Belfast—the Minister who guided the destinies of the War Office during its most triumphant period—was too busy with his £5,000 a year to bother himself with the social questions which moved the minds and consciences of his constituents. Then there were the two gentlemen from Trinity College, one with £6,000 a year, and the other with £2,000. Then there was the hon. and learned Member for Londonderry, the indignant, the theatrical gentleman—the gentleman who lost his temper—who got only £600 a year, as a Public Prosecutor. He was greatly struck with one observation which the hon. Gentleman made. He said—

> "This policy of taking what you can get, in order that you may gradually get more, is one which commends itself to me."

And then there was Mr. Atkinson, now Lord Atkinson, who had transferred his genius and capacity to a better place—with £6,000 a year. He would do the Ulster Party this credit, that however anxious they were for titles, they would not take them without salary. He had always been told by the Ulster Members—"Wait till you get to Ulster and then you need never expect to come back to the House of Commons." Well, he had gone to Ulster and where was the gentleman who had so repeatedly challenged him across the floor of the House—the only man of brains and ability in the whole Unionist Party? Mr. Moore, who was to sweep out of existence the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who was the chief antagonist of one of the "traitors" who got up the Ulster Hall meeting—Mr. Moore was swept away while they all remained. He himself had 600 votes against him on the register, but he appealed to the people on the broad platform of industrial reform and progress, and above all on the one question which he would never submit to any other—the question of the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs. He believed that policy would ultimately be successful, and it was not the business of honest men guided by civic and national spirit to divide themselves on religious issues. The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had somewhat foolishly introduced into the debate the subject of the meeting held in the great Ulster Hall, addressed by the hon. Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool, because a fortnight afterwards the right hon. and gallant Gentleman held a meeting in the great loyal city, and he could not get a hearing. Noble lords passed one by one before what they thought was the frightened democracy, but the democracy was not afraid of the noble lords. The late Secretary for War dared not go within miles of the city. The late Chief Secretary for Ireland was counting up the lodger votes, and had not time to attend. But the hon. Member for Londonderry was there, and he was cheered uproariously. And on the next occasion when they dared to hold a meeting in that Hall, they had to get all the old military influence for the purpose of protecting themselves behind their closed doors. What was the logical conclusion of all this? As he had often said, the Unionist Members did not represent Ulster—they did not represent half Ulster—and they were in the House to protect specific interests. The old bad feeling had not been killed, but please God it would be killed before long. He had been waiting to hear the stock arguments about intimidation and preventing people from performing their duties, but the right hon. and gallant Gentleman prudently did not make any reference to those topics. One Member of the group with which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was associated had asked a series of questions as to why the Chief Secretary was not pursuing his coercion policy in Ireland. Those questions related to the prosecution of two of his hon. friends, where in spite of the jury's being packed eight were for acquittal, and only four for a conviction. These hon. Members went down to a peaceful district to arrange a peaceful compromise between landlord and tenant, and to give advice on the subject. As the result of their action they were brought before the magistrates and then dragged before the Court of Assize. He would like to give the House a specimen of some of the tactics of the hon. Gentlemen who came forward as the Simon Pures of justice and administration. Belfast was a great city, and he was proud of it and its sons. He believed that under a well-ordered Government the Roman Catholic and the Protestant workmen in that city would work side by side. A Mr. Carlisle, however, had had the stupendous audacity to offer himself there as a candidate for one of the divisions. Of course, any one who chose to pay the piper might be allowed to enter into the arena of political conflict. Mr. Carlisle, who was the head of Queen's Island and employed 18,000 men and paid £20,000 a week in wages, was surely as entitled to come forward and offer himself as a candidate as an hon. Member who had no connection with the constituency and no other qualifications to recommend him anywhere. The *Northern Whig* said about this candidature—

> "The question is, what does Mr. Carlisle mean to do? The time is short and the decision means more to him than perhaps he realises. If this man, whatever he calls himself, and whatever section he claims to represent, helps to hand over one section of the City of Belfast to the bawling blackguards of the United Irish League"—

—he was one of the bawling blackguards—

> "he had better make arrangments to shift his quarters in twenty-four hours."

He had not doubt that a few hon. Gentlemen would have been absent from those benches had it not been for similar tactics more ingeniously pursued and more widely applied in Ulster. The hon. Member who sat for South Derry obtained a majority of seventy—although a Protestant he was a progressive reformer who did not think it his duty to stand bound for ever, and who thought there was some other music in the world besides that to be obtained from a big drum on the 12th of July. He was a man who knew that there were labourers living on 12s. a week in rural parts of Ireland under conditions which would be a disgrace to any country in the world. Some of their candidates were beaten by perhaps the worst system of electoral terrorism ever seen at a Parliamentary election. Those who had beaten them were the men who appealed to the Nonconformists as representing the religious sentiment of the country. He pleaded with Englishmen to do something for Ireland, which had given the world ambassadors, thinkers, philosophers, orators, poets, politicians, and the greatest geniuses in the professions and commerce. In Ireland there was poverty and desolation, a fleeing population, lands going out of cultivation, every sign of retrogression. That was due to the fact that, while Irishmen had been allowed to do something to build up the fortunes of other lands, they had not been permitted to do anything for their own land. He believed, however, that a better and more glorious day had now arisen for Ireland.

*MR. DODD (Tyrone, N.) said the spirit which had animated the Member for South Derry was not common to the people of the north of Ireland. As a matter of testimony rather than argument, he might be permitted to say that he was a Protestant of the Protestants, but he stood upon the platform in North Tyrone surrounded by priests of the Church of Rome. He declared that he had never contributed to any ecclesiastical structure connected with the Church of Rome. Yet he was selected as their candidate, and although his opponent was a Catholic he was elected. He believed they would never have a united, contented, and prosperous Ireland until they had Protestant and Catholic joining in one common struggle for the good of their native land. The Amendment was hopelessly wrong. By what possible machinery could any system of government that Parliament would grant endanger the liberties of the Protestant minority? Their liberty could only be endangered if they broke the law. Would they tell the House in what particular way they thought their liberties or their property would be endangered? He had in vain endeavour to find that out. He had studied with great care the two great works just issued from the Press, the "Life of Gladstone" and the "Life of Lord Randolph Churchill," and he had struggled to find out what hon. Gentlemen opposite were afraid of. Did they fear that a proposition would be made to injure their religion? That was idle and absurd. Did they fear that a tax would be put on the food and the industries of Belfast which would not be put on any other part of the country? What else did it mean if it did not mean that? They knew that the bogey was started for the purpose of keeping the people apart and preventing the two sections of democracy in Ireland joining hands. Hon. Members opposite spoke about the police, but that was a question which could be discussed under any system of legislation. What objection was there to the county councils governing the police? The police of Ireland was as fine a force as could be found anywhere. They were selected without regard to race or religion and did their duty like men; was it contended that they would do their duty less well if, instead of being directed from the Castle, they were directed by the county councils, or was it suggested that while they did the work of the Castle now they would do the work of the county councils then? If they were well officered and well manned they would always do their work well. He had made a compact with his people of North Tyrone to support the democratic policy of the Prime Minister, and he had been told by them that he was not to speak in this House in such a way as ever to interfere with the progress of the business of the House. They had given him a mandate to support the Prime Minister and to support any good, sound measure of local government to Ireland consonant with and tending to the efficiency of the United Kingdom. When he was addressing his people in North Tyrone and spoke to them of Chinese labour, he said nothing about torture, for he knew that that sort of thing could be exaggerated; and he said nothing about outrages, because he knew they could be manufactured. He addressed his people from the standpoint that the system adopted in South Africa was one which struck at the root of individual freedom of thought and action, and he would support the right hon. Gentleman in the method by which he proposed to deal with it. He thought they were doing a good thing in trying to bind together these two countries. That was not a policy which divided; it was a policy that did not hurt but healed; it was a policy that had been adopted by the majority of the people of North Tyrone, and he hoped it would be carried out in a spirit of peace, true friendship, and Christian charity.

*MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said he was in the unique position of not being in agreement with any of the right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who had taken part in the debate, nor was he likely to be in agreement with those who would hereafter take part in the debate, because he not only opposed the policy of Home Rule, but he was charged by Unionists with supporting it. He was charged by Unionist Members on his right with being an unsound Unionist, and he was charged by Nationalists on his left with being one of the worst kind of Unionists—[Cries of "No."],—one of that kind who were more determinedly opposed to Home Rule than any other kind, because there was no kind of reform introduced for the benefit of Ireland that he had not given his vote for. The success of the hon. Member for West Belfast was due to the fact not that Unionists were less determined against Home Rule, but that they resented being dictated to and being treated badly by those who should have been their friends. His own election in 1902 was a protest against Home Rule. They had all heard of the great Ulster Hall meeting. The fact of the matter was that on that platform men were put up to speak who had been called traitors and renegades and lundies and if they had been called renegades and traitors and lundies did anyone expect that they would be listened to in another place. The responsibility of that was due to the bad manners and bad treatment given to them in different parts of the country when they were trying to obtain their rights. He had been sent there to fulfil certain pledges to his constituents, and he was there desirous and determined to do so, no matter whom it pleased, so far as his judgment and his ability would let him, irrespective of Party. In that way he came into conflict with those with whom he would rather be in union. In his view, everything that was for the betterment of Ireland should have his support, whether the suggestion came from a Nationalist Member or from the leader of the Ulster Party. He was proud of the fact that he was an Irishman. He meant an Irishman of Ireland, and it was his duty as such an Irishman to do all that lay in his power, and he believed with the full consent of his constituents, to better the condition of the people and place them in a more prosperous condition. It did not matter whether the transfer from landlord to tenant was from Catholic to Protestant or Protestant to Catholic. There were so many things in Ireland upon which they did agree that it was pitiful that on the one question upon which they did not agree both sides should allow it to be paraded before Members who did not know Ireland or its grievances or local circumstances. He assured the House, which included so many Members who were new to its work, and were free from the trammels and considerations of any particular Party, that Ireland, so far as the North was concerned, was as Unionist to-day as ever it was, notwithstanding the local changes that had taken place. He admitted that a new spirit had been introduced. A feeling which had come to stay had arisen in that country and was going to make itself felt. It would not be sufficient to come to the House and make speeches. During the recent election there were some candidates who had nothing to tell their constituents except about himself. After a session's work they could only tell his constituents that the Member for South Belfast was all right in the House, that he was one of the best men they had of his class, and then having for three-quarters of an hour occupied the attention of his constituents by praising him they finished up by saying it would be a disgrace to let him go back with the same freedom as before, and therefore he must be opposed. And he was opposed. He was responsible to his constituents for his work in Parliament, and it was rather inconsistent of the men who commended that work to say it would be a disgrace to give him that liberty. Notwithstanding these differences he did not think there was any change in the spirit or feeling in regard to the Union. He did not think the present Government fought the last election on the question of Home Rule. He thought it was the Unionist Party. He had said that if the Liberal Party were to introduce a Home Rule Bill they could say, "We did not mention the question of Home Rule, but you did." And that was worthy of note. He did not believe it was the question before the country at all. Some talked of devolution by instalments. He did not know how they were going to criticise the present Government if they were going to bring that in. It would be a very difficult thing. The only consolation he had was that he was not a party to the other business. Unionists were responsible for introducing in an insidious way that which was not their policy. It left them in a very awkward position. It was true that the late Lord-Lieutenant, Lord Dudley, governed Ireland according to Irish ideas.

AN HON. MEMBER: He said he would.

MR. SLOAN: I think he largely tried.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: He said he would and he would not.

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER: And then he did not.

MR. SLOAN said if ever there was a man who deserved the honour and confidence of the Party it was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, who was sincere in everything he did, who stood to his guns, and very often carried the burdens of other people. New Members of Parliament hearing the speeches of the Members for North Armagh, South Derry, West Belfast, and North Tyrone would perhaps come to the conclusion that there was a change of political opinion in regard to the question of the Union. He believed there was a great change coming over the people, that reforms were not only necessary but were going to be demanded, and that the time was coming when no Member could come to the House, certainly from the North of Ireland, and say one thing to his constituents and act differently in the House. There was an honest desire on the part of the democracy in the North of Ireland to do justice to all, believing that they had as good a right to their Unionist beliefs and convictions as they admitted Nationalists had to their convictions on Home Rule. They also felt that while they admitted the Nationalists' right the Nationalists should respect theirs. They should not try how often they could cross each other on the one question which was the dividing line of both, but should endeavour to act together in promoting that which was for the uplifting, the betterment, the happiness, and prosperity of Ireland. He was afraid misunderstandings had been created in the new House with regard to Ireland. They were not a bigoted minority. Bigotry did not apply to the democracy of the North of Ireland. He thought there was evidence of that in the fact that the Member for West Belfast never had a meeting broken up. The narrow bigotry to which reference had been made did not apply to the Protestant democracy of the North of Ireland. He had not exaggerated nor had he tried to conceal anything which he thought he was in duty bound to say. He represented the most industrial, intellectual, and intelligent constituency in Ireland, and he would always try, so far as he could, impartially and without prejudice to do his duty to those constituents and to his country.

*MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.) said he desired to speak to the House of the British workmen's view of the Irish question. He thought most of them on those benches in their election addresses made a strong point that Home Rule should be granted to Ireland without qualification or reservation, and the success of that policy was shown in the fact that there were twenty-nine Members on those benches returned upon the independent labour ticket. They had to contend in the election with very much the same thing that had been heard that afternoon. During the stress of the fight it had even been stated from public platforms that they intended marching through rapine and murder to Home Rule. But the British working man had been reading deeply and widely during the last ten years, and was not to be caught by bogies of that character. He wanted as an Irishman to refer to the constant taunt that only one portion of Ireland was loyal. His answer to this was to be found in the record of Irishmen who had come from the South and West and who had died to maintain the prestige of the British nation. If they wished to get rid of all this bitterness upon Irish questions it would be well to cut out the religious controversy, and look at the subject from a wider and broader point of view. The vast majority of the people of Ireland had repeatedly declared in favour of Home Rule, and as the representative of a large Yorkshire labour constituency he ventured to predict that the great principle of self-government which His Majesty's Government intended conferring upon the Transvaal would also be granted to Ireland, and thus Irish hopes and aspirations were within measurable distance of the realisation. Green, the historian, wrote that no Englishman could read the history of Ireland during the fifty years that followed its conquest by William III. without his cheeks tingling with the blush of shame. That in a sense applied to its government even till recent times, but he thought the day had now come when at least the working men of Great Britain and Ireland could join hands upon this great question of self-government for Ireland. That was a principle which the Labour Party would stand up for upon all occasions. In conclusion he said he had only done his duty as an Irishman and a Labour man by intervening at this stage in the debate, and if he had strayed in any way out of the ordinary path he submitted himself to the consideration of the House.

LORD CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said he was afraid that it might seem presumptuous on the part of a new Member to venture to address the House on the third day of the first session of this Parliament, but he claimed their indulgence. His reason for occupying their attention was that he considered this Amendment to be one upon which from hereditary traditions he claimed to have a right to say a few words. He had listened with interest to the remarks which had fallen from hon. Members below the gangway, and he could find nothing in them which led him to believe that they had in any way changed their views. Their avowed object still was to bring about that separation of Ireland from England which to his mind could only mean ruin to Ireland. In the Speech from the Throne he noted the words—

> "It is my desire that the Government of the country, in reliance upon the ordinary law, should be carried on, so far as existing circumstances permit, in a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people."

He maintained that the late Government had carried on the government of Ireland in pursuance of the wishes of the Irish people. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh, oh!"] Was the Irish Local Government Act or the Land Purchase Act not entirely consistent with the views of the Irish people, and could it be said that those measures had in any sense been a failure? They had been successful, not only from what they had seen of their working, but also from the Nationalist testimony which had been borne to them. No one was more in sympathy than he with the view that Ireland ought to be governed according to Irish ideas, but those ideas must be consistent with the unity of the Empire, and he very much doubted whether the ideas of the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway were in any way the same as the ideas held by himself and the men with whom he was proud to be allied in Ulster. Were they to judge of the Nationalists by their speeches, which pointed only too plainly to the fact that their one aim and object was the complete separation of Ireland from England? He thought he might venture to say that this House was entitled to know the views of the Prime Minister and his colleagues upon this question. There were two grounds upon which he maintained that this information should be forthcoming. One of them was the very confident speech made by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, in which he laid down that there must be Home Rule and nothing short of it; and the other was that the members of the Government in their speeches and hon. Members opposite in their election addresses made scarcely any allusion to this most important question. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] He ventured to say that hon. Members opposite would not have experienced such inconvenient overcrowding on the Ministerial Benches, and the Government would not have occupied the proud and independent position they now enjoyed, if Home Rule had been the issue before the electors. In the King's Speech there was one point on which the whole House would be agreed—that in which His Majesty's Ministers expressed their desire that their legislation would conduce to the maintenance of tranquility and good feeling between different classes of the community. This object had already been attained by the legislation of the late Government. He maintained that any reversal of this policy such as any scheme of Home Rule or devolution would involve, would of necessity hand over Ulster to the dominion of those who in the past had never been conspicuous in maintaining tranquillity in Ireland. They in Ulster could look back to a hundred years of increasing prosperity, and they attributed that prosperity absolutely and entirely to the Union. Before the Union Ulster was the poorest province in Ireland; now Ulster was named the "Garden of Ireland." Belfast was now the third port in the United Kingdom. Ulster men were not inclined to hand over their prosperity and wealth to men who could not claim that same prosperity and wealth in other parts of Ireland. They who supported this Amendment were opposed to Home Rule in any shape or form. It might be presented in the nature of a definite and comprehensive scheme, and they naturally opposed that; or it might be presented in the more insidious way of instalments. It might be the system of instalments described last night by the hon. Member for South Hackney. That hon. Gentleman suggested that paying by instalments was a very expensive way of paying a debt. He, himself, maintained that England was in no sense in the debt of Ireland. If ever England was in that position the last Government had most adequately discharged the debt by their legislation for the benefit of all classes of the community in Ireland. It was his deep conviction that the separation of Ireland from England in any form could only mean the ruin of the country to which he was so deeply attached by ties of affection and associations of interest.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the House had somewhat lost sight of the actual text both of the King's Speech and of the Amendment. He had no doubt that the hon. Gentlemen who met last night to draw up the Amendment had considerable difficulty in doing so, but the principle on which it had been drawn was quite clear. It was the same principle as that on which the Ulster elections were fought. The only principle of the Amendment was an attempt to frighten the Members of the House of Commons, just as the representatives of the Opposition attempted to frighten the people at the elections. The hon. Member for South Derry conveniently omitted to quote one paragraph of the King's Speech until he was reminded of it. It read thus:

> My Ministers have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies in the system of Government in Ireland.

He would like to ask any Ulster Member if he thought it possible to maintain the present financial arrangements between the two countries. Ireland and Scotland had exactly the same population, and the cost of Government in Ireland was £2,000,000 a year more than in Scotland, though Scotland was a richer country than Ireland. Could that system go on simply to satisfy a few gentlemen—happily diminishing in number—in the province of Ulster? The paragraph in the Speech also stated that it was the Government's object to introduce into Irish government means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs. Was there anything extravagant in that? Did Unionist Members lay it down that the Government of Ireland ought to be conducted in defiance of the views of the country? That was what England had been doing for centuries. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had read into the Speech a meaning of their own. He was prepared to wait until the Government told them what they proposed to do. He thought it was the duty of supporters of the Government at least to wait until that explanation was made. If it was unsatisfactory, they could then vote against it. If it was satisfactory, as he believed it would be, they would be glad to support it. With the facts of the present day, it required a good deal of courage in Unionist Members to talk about the state of Ireland, and especially about the state of Ulster. In olden times he did not hesitate to denounce crime in Ireland, but what were the facts in Ulster to-day? He had received that morning a letter from Londonderry County, from Mr. Robert Baily, a man of seventy years of age, one of the most respected Presbyterian farmers in that county, who had fought in every Derry contest for forty years on the Liberal side. Let the House listen to what he had got as a reward from those Gentlemen who were represented on the opposite side of the House—

> "On the 31st January at midnight my family and myself were aroused by flames proceeding from a large barn and hay-shed. On visiting the place we found a large two-storey barn containing hay and straw consumed by fire. In an adjoining field a large shed roofed with corrugated iron was also consumed by fire. A large portable fowlhouse containing a stock of fowls also fired, and the fowls burnt to a cinder; and out in the field a three-year old bullock lying with its throat cut."

Now he challenged hon. Gentlemen opposite who represented, according to their own story, law and order in Ireland, to produce a paragraph from any Unionist paper containing even a report of that outrage. The whole thing had been deliberately suppressed.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N): This incident has been openly and repeatedly published in a thoroughly Unionist paper.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Did you denounce it?

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said that was what he wanted to know. There were three great Unionist papers in Belfast, but in none of them had this outrage been denounced or condemned. In South Down also a body of men went through the constituency wrecking the houses of Nationalists. They assaulted the police, and they were brought before the petty sessions. Yes, but who had appointed the magistrates of Ireland for twenty years? If there was the slightest tinge of politics about a case brought into those courts they might as well save their money and stay at home. These men were not sent to gaol as they would have been had they been Nationalists, but a fine was imposed upon them. Much they cared for a fine! The man who seconded his own nomination, Mr. Hugh M. Simpson—a large Presbyterian farmer, and as respectable a man as could be found in the whole country — was struck down with an iron bar, and, on his way home after the poll, he was knocked down and trampled upon by a band of ruffians. If the finger of a bailiff had been injured in the south of Ireland they would have had the whole district proclaimed under the Crimes Act, and a couple of resident magistrates sent down to try the criminals. That was what was going on. The right hon. Member for South Dublin went to South Tyrone, and he was greatly pleased with his visit; it was an agreeable variation.

The right hon. Gentleman was not up to concert pitch. His speech was not strong enough for the local Orange taste. They thought it a very poor affair indeed compared with what they were accustomed to. He was very far from associating the right hon. Gentleman with any of these outrages in South Tyrone, but hon. Gentlemen opposite had talked about Ulster being a law-abiding province. Very well, if these outrages were to go on, it was high time that they denounced them. Why should Presbyterian ministers be boycotted? Why should outrages of the kind he had described be committed simply because these men did not vote with the Orange Party in Ulster? Hon. Gentlemen opposite had better talk less about the law-abiding character of the people of Ulster unless they denounced these outrages. Hon. Gentlemen opposite came to this House and always said that they were the sole protectors of the Protestants of Ireland. He did not believe it. He received another letter that morning from a Protestant minister in the south, who wrote—

> "I have never been in favour of Home Rule. I have always remained a Liberal in politics and felt sorry the Presbyterians sold themselves completely to a Party that had no sympathy whatever for them and merely used them as tools for election purposes."

That gentleman, though he lived in the south, had absolutely diagnosed the position in the north. "Ulster politics," he said, "however seem well nigh hopeless." He did not agree with him. He trebled his majority. He could not expect to do more than that. [AN HON. MEMBER: I did better.] He thought if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University had had to face an Ulster constituency, instead of the sleepy constituency of Trinity College, he would not have done as well as he (Mr. Russell) did.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I did not interrupt the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: You said you would have done better than I did.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: No I did not.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL apologised and said someone else on that side had made the remark.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: At the same time I hope you will go on attacking me.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the expression must have come from someone on the other side, but if he had made a mistake he was very sorry for it. In the Speech there was one paragraph which might mean anything, but why people should read a Home Rule Parliament into it he did not know. The expression was vague, he admitted, but he was prepared to wait until he ascertained by further explanation what it meant, and he was not going to vote against the Address because there was a vague paragraph in the Speech from the Throne about Ireland. He thought it was a wonderful thing that hon. Members opposite should raise the question of giving Home Rule by instalments. Who was the author of that policy? He remembered one night last session when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover read a letter, or rather two letters —one from Sir Antony MacDonnell and his reply. That was the first step in regard to the instalment system. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover thought he had settled the land question, and then he was going on to settle the question of higher education, another burning question; then he was going on to deal with the co-ordination of detached boards. Then he was going on to deal with the extension of Local Government.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover): I do not think I ever made any proposals for the extension of Local Government.

*MR T. W. RUSSELL said that the answer to the observation was that Sir Antony MacDonnell was more than a civil servant, he was a colleague of the late Chief Secretary, and probably it was he who made the suggestion about the extension of local self-government What was the use of right hon. Gentlemen talking about the instalment system when they were the real authors of it? Moreover, what did they mean when they came and said that Home Rule was not an issue at the general election? The hon. Member for Londonderry said it was not the issue at the general election, but it was the only issue he fought, morning, noon, and night. Some of them saw the danger they were in when hon. Members opposite came forward with a programme which tied the question of the Union on to the rotten carcass of Protection. When, however, the early election results at Manchester and Salford swept the decks, the members of the Opposition speedily declared that this Parliament would have no mandate for Home Rule. That was to say, they used Home Rule to frighten the British people. They then spent £5,000 in sending an army of speakers to England to speak against Home Rule. The House would, however, have heard a different story if the Party opposite had been returned. He was an Ulster Member, and he said that hon. Gentlemen opposite were not the representatives of the majority of that Province. Their great leader used to talk about "this sickening cant of conciliation," but he had now got an opportunity to ruminate on the subject. He was not saying—it would be folly to say—that Ulster had been converted to Home Rule. Such a statement would not be true, and nobody had a right to deceive the House. He would, however, tell the House of Commons that there was growing up an irresistible feeling of disgust, first of all, at the inefficiency of those gentlemen who represented Ulster. They knew perfectly well what was said about them in Ulster. They were called a group of deadheads. There was a feeling of disgust, and a growing feeling of Liberalism in the Province. It was Liberal once, and he believed it would be Liberal again, and hon. Members would find that they would not be able to frighten it with their Home Rule "bogey." There were men now in Ulster who saw men as trees walking, and who saw that if the country was not to be ruined the people must unite for her welfare and salvation. The hope of Ireland lay in that. Every great Act of Parliament since the Union had been passed in restraint of the privileges of the minority in the North of Ireland. His conviction was that those men would be driven to make peace with their adversaries. With a democratic Parliament and household suffrage they could not permanently and ultimately govern a country against the will of its people. Sooner or later the Irish Unionist Party, with all its narrowness, would be forced to make better terms with the men they called their enemies than they could do with those who were their friends.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had soared into the realms of prophecy, a course he was not prepared to follow. He would not tell the House what would happen six years hence, but what had happened at the last general election. The hon. Gentleman had told them that the supporters of the Unionists of Belfast were diminishing in numbers. The hon. Member, whose exact political position he defied the most acute observer to define, had thought fit during the late election to rake up a number of otherwise respectable men to contest certain constituencies in Ulster. The hon. Gentleman's nominees had been beaten in every case. Two seats formerly held by gentlemen known in the House as his followers—his tail—had been swept away by substantial majorities. In one case, North Antrim, the sitting Member for that constituency did not know whether he was a follower of the hon. Member for South Tyrone or of the hon. Member for South Belfast. The Unionists in Ulster were in a stronger position by many thousands of votes than they were before the general election. But Nationalist or Radical Members were not to assure themselves too much that the winning of one seat in West Belfast meant any diminution of Unionist feeling in that constituency. Nothing of the kind. There was a gentleman in Belfast who, to gratify his own personal petty spite—[NATIONALIST cries of "Withdraw"; "He is a more honourable man than you"]—he repeated, to gratify his own personal spite—

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): You are saying that under the protection of Parliament; you would not say that outside the House.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I have said it outside. That gentleman came forward and contested the seat not with any intention of winning it, but for the declared purpose of keeping the Unionist out of the seat and handing it over to the Nationalists. It was a temporary victory, and one which would be reversed at the earliest possible moment. The hon. Member for South Belfast objected to the position he (Mr. Craig) took up with regard to his election. What he said was that the Unionist electors in his constituency ought to oppose him to a man, and he still stood by that advice. The Member for South Belfast claimed to be a Unionist, and until the close of the last Parliament the other Members of the Ulster Unionist Party worked in perfect harmony with him and he with them. So far as he (Mr. Craig) was personally concerned he might tell the House that until the 12th July last he did his best as a private citizen of Belfast to smooth over the Opposition that then arose in the constituency and to secure the hon. Member's unopposed return. But on the 12th July, which corresponded somewhat with St. Patrick's Day, most of the Ulster Unionists attended a demonstration of the Orange Order, and the hon. Member for South Belfast attended a demonstration of what is known as the Independent Orange Order, and at this latter demonstration there was given forth to the world a wonderful manifesto which referred to the dangers that had been faced by the adoption of the elective principle in Ireland, but said that that principle having been conceded by the Unionists under the Local Government Act it could not now be seriously disputed and must proceed to its logical conclusion. It further stated—

> "The weakness of the devolution proposals lay in their reactionary tendency, and in their attempts to set aside the elective principle . . . . Unionism is likewise a discredited creed."

MR. SLOAN: I do not think it is fair to myself that the hon. Gentleman should cease reading at that point.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he would read the next sentence which was—

> "But the effect of the Unionist policy in Ireland has been to weaken the secular forces of the country and to increase the power and influence of clericalism in every department of life."

When he read that declaration by the hon. Member for South Belfast he had qualms in his mind as to his Unionism. He dared say that that manifesto received warm-hearted support from Gentlemen below the gangway, but Unionists then thought and still thought they saw in that manifesto indications of a great change of opinion on the part of the hon. Member. On the publication of this manifesto many thought that the hon. Member for South Belfast ought to be publicly denounced for his share in it, but no action was taken, because they expected that either the hon. Member would explain it in some way, or would repudiate it, or that the independent Orangemen would bring him to task. Such was the state of affairs when October arrived. About that time the Member for South Belfast, who had acted as a colleague of Mr. William Moore the late Member for North Antrim, took the extraordinary action of going with a deputation to another gentleman to ask him to stand against Mr. Moore. These two actions—this manifesto and his action in seeking to oppose a colleague—were quite enough to make him (Mr. Craig) wish that a person who was guilty of such a want of good faith to a colleague should be opposed. It was true that they were unsuccessful in winning South Belfast, but they did effect a great change in the composition of the majority who had sent him to the House. He got in with practically the same majority as last time, but whereas on the last occasion every Nationalist in the division voted against him, on this occasion every Nationalist voted for him. That appeared also to indicate a certain change in the hon. Gentleman's views. There had been so many taunts at the Members of the Ulster Unionist Party that day that it would be difficult for one to reply to all.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [21st February] to Main Question [19th February], "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that large numbers of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Ireland view with alarm the statement that Your Majesty's Ministers have under consideration proposals to effect changes in the system of Government in Ireland, believing that Your Majesty's present advisers by their past declarations have committed themselves to a policy which will endanger the liberties and property of the loyalist minority, promote discord and civil strife, and impair the integrity of the United Kingdom.' "—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added." Debate resumed.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG, continuing his speech, said he denied that the Nationalist Party was any stronger now than before the dissolution, and asserted that the Irish Unionist Party was in a better position than before the election. He also denied the truth of the assertion that the Irish Unionist Party was bigoted. He had always maintained that the Unionist Party in Ireland was free from bigotry. The Nationalists boasted that they had several Protestants in their Party, and although the Unionist Party had no Roman Catholics among their number, they did their level best at the last election to return a Roman Catholic in the person of Mr. Denis Henry, who was beaten by only nine votes. There were several reasons why they objected to Home Rule or devolution, which they looked upon as a step towards Home Rule. The words in the King's Speech regarding the subject were vague, and he had no doubt they were purposely vague. But it was nevertheless their duty as defenders of the Union to put upon them the most sinister construction they could. If they turned out to be less sinister than they anticipated, so much the better. It was their business to place before the House the fact that some inroads on the Union was going to be attempted by the present Government. They had been twitted for forcing the question of Home Rule to the front during the election, but their position was perfectly logical and clear. Whether it was the intention or not of the Government to bring in legislation which would endanger the Union, it was their duty to show to the English people that they were as determined as ever to oppose any alteration in the Constitution. If they found the Government had no such intention their position was still logical, and he might go further and say that, if that proved to be the case, they might reasonably claim that the stand taken by the Unionist constituencies in Ireland had had a certain effect upon the Liberal Government. He begged new Members not to take for gospel everything they heard put forward in favour of Home Rule, or even put forward against it from the Members on these Benches. Let them if possible examine the question on the spot. If they did so he was certain they would come to the conclusion that no case had been shown for an alteration in the Constitution. For the moment they had to deal not with Home Rule itself, but with an insidious step which if taken would lead to Home Rule. The Prime Minister or some other prominent member of the Government had said that a mistake had been made in the past by introducing a Home Rule Bill, and that what they must do in the future was to bring it in in instalments, the object being of course to hoodwink the electors. It was apparently the intention to bring it in in small instalments so that the English electors would not be able to see the seriousness of it. But having once granted these first steps it would be impossible for them to draw back. New Members must study whether Home Rule in its bald form was necessary or ought to be granted to Ireland. The strongest point they adduced in their opposition to Home Rule was that Home Rule was not needed in Ireland. The conditions under which they lived in the north of Ireland and with which they were satisfied were the same conditions as those under which the people in the south lived, where they professed to be discontented. Wherein did the Nationalists live under a Government which was more oppressive to them than to those in the north. He defied a single

Member to show that the liberties they enjoyed were less than or different from the liberties enjoyed in the north. It was fruitless in this question to go back 300 years. It was the facts of the present time they had to face, and these proved that there was no necessity for Home Rule. The fore-fathers of the people in the north of Ireland came over from Scotland and England, and a finer or sturdier body of men was never produced. They went over to the north of Ireland, which was then practically a virgin forest, and faced and overcame the greatest difficulties, for that part of the country was not endowed by nature with the same advantages, from an agricultural point of view, as the south and west. They brought the country to the state of prosperity in which it now was. These Ulster settlers had suffered from natural and unnatural difficulties; the hostilty of the Established Church at that time to every form of dissent was of so relentless a character that the persecution year by year from which those unfortunate people suffered was such as had never been carried on against any other people in Ireland. Yet in face of all the drawbacks which they had to face, the people in the north of Ireland had prospered. They had had their land difficulties brought about by the opening up of other continents and the consequent depression of agriculture; they had had their difficulties brought about by that and other causes, in the same way as Great Britain had had her land difficulties, and hon. Members had only to take these facts into consideration and look for themselves and they would see why, in spite of all these serious drawbacks, the men of the north who were now asking the House not to sanction Home Rule were still determined that the constitution which they had enjoyed for a hundred years should not be altered in any form if they could help it. The fact was, that the men of the south and west had not taken advantage of their opportunities in the same way as had the men in the north. Would any hon. Member say how it came about that in the north there was a comparatively flourishing agricultural industry, a large and flourishing linen industry, a large shipbuilding industry, and numerous other industries, giving employment to thousands of hands, spreading money about, and bringing an amount of prosperity with which the people of the north were perfectly well satisfied, if it was not owing to their having taken advantage of their opportunities? Let hon. Members look at their towns. Belfast was one of the most unique examples which the world could produce. Besides Belfast they had a large number of other towns in which hon. Gentlemen would see signs of increasing prosperity on every side. If new Members would only study the question for themselves they would see that there was no necessity for any scheme of devolution and no reason why the south and west of Ireland should not be content with the liberty they enjoyed in common with the people of Ulster. He did not mean that there was no necessity for further Irish legislation. He was pleased that the labourers' question was to be dealt with by the present Government; but the prosperity of the north of Ireland showed that there could be no reason, apart from the fault of the people themselves, why the rest of Ireland could not flourish under the same Constitution. The hon. Member for South Tyrone marvelled why they raised the question of Home Rule by instalments. But he need not marvel, for last session the Unionists of Ireland lost not a moment in opposing the devolution proposals, with which they believed certain members of the Government in Ireland were connected. The late Chief Secretary resigned because he felt that he could no longer be useful to Ireland. When members of a Government which they themselves supported were supposed to have been connected with such proposals they had felt it their duty to bring the matter before the House, and they would continue to denounce such proposals on every occasion. He objected that any hon. Member should consider the position of the Irish Unionists was in any way altered because of the facts that came out last session. They were in the same position as before, and the position of the Unionist Party as a whole on Home Rule was precisely the same as ever.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): I should like to call the attention of the House to the Amendment we are now discussing, which has been largely lost sight of in the debate. The Amendment represents that large numbers of His Majesty's subjects view with alarm the statement that His Majesty's Ministers have under consideration proposals to effect changes in the system of government in Ireland. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a statement which every one who has listened to the debate will say is absolutely untrue. I cannot believe there is anybody in Ireland who views with alarm the statement that proposals are under consideration for effecting changes in the system of government in that country. I believe that every one considers that changes are needed in the system of government in Ireland. But there is another part of the statement in the Amendment with which I entirely disagree—namely, the statement that large numbers of His Majesty's subjects, distrusting the King's present Ministers, view the statement in the Speech with alarm. Those who live in this state of panic are a very small number, and I believe they are a diminishing number. It is a number which dwindles steadily every year, and when I compare the state of opinion now with what it was in 1886, I am surprised at the magnitude and profundity of the change. The arguments used in support of this Amendment to-night ought to have shown that there was no need for change in the government of Ireland; but nobody has denied the need for change, not even the right hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Amendment. He made a lively and humorous speech of which I hope he will permit me to say that I have always liked that speech. It is a good many years since I first heard it, and I think I really liked it to-night better than ever, because the right hon. Gentleman was so good-natured as to give me nothing to answer. He did not advance any arguments. He began by saying that he was very much surprised when he saw the King's Speech that there were no Home Rule proposals in it, and then proceeded to say that after all he supposed there must be Home Rule in it. The latter part of his speech contradicted absolutely the first part. In fact, he fired his pistol in the air. The seconder of the Amendment added very little. He said that the last thing the people of this country thought of during the General Election was Home Rule; but it was very stupid of them if they did not think of it, and they must have paid very little heed to the leaders of the Opposition, for statements were made from every Tory platform, and were repeated by all the newspapers on the Tory side, that Home Rule was the main and supreme issue before the country. The hon. Member complained that we did not tell him what changes His Majesty's Ministers were considering, that they were hidden behind a curtain. But that did not prevent him from making many lunges with his sword at that curtain in the hope of hitting somebody behind it. He argued that it must be Home Rule which we were contemplating, because nothing else could be expected from His Majesty's present Ministers. The gracious Speech from the Throne contains nothing that was not stated over and over again by the Prime Minister and by every prominent Member of the Liberal Party during the last election, and those statements were endorsed after they had been repeatedly made by the enormous majority which we see returned to this House of Commons. Two other speeches require a word perhaps from me. One is the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone. While disagreeing with the views he expressed, I think we on this side of the House recognise the talent and grace with which it was composed and delivered, and we gladly welcome the noble Lord to our debates, and hope he will take a frequent part in them. The speech of the hon. Member for South Antrim contained really nothing that seems to call for special comment, because it was chiefly devoted to the praises of Ulster. I am the last man to deny the justice of the praises he bestowed on the energy and industry of the people of Ulster, and I can assure him that the Government will never propose anything which in their opinion will injure the prosperity of Ulster. Nevertheless, the Members who have spoken in support of the Amendment have agreed in condemning by anticipation whatever proposals the Government may make. What are we then to suppose? Apparently, since they condemn all changes, they hold that the present system of government in Ireland is all that it ought to be; that it is a satisfactory situation, when we find the administration carried on at a cost much greater in proportion to the population and wealth of the island than is the administration of England and Scotland; and that the number of boards is so unusually large. I suppose also that those hon. Gentlemen must think that education in Ireland, primary, intermediate, and University, is in a satisfactory state, and that there is no pauperism in Ireland beyond what might naturally be expected from the size of the population. And what has become of those complaints of the neglect of various public works and various matters of that kind, which I think I have often heard from the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh? Speaking with great diffidence, as I have only just come to know something of Ireland, I believe there is a very great deal to be done in Ireland both to cheapen and to improve the administration of the country. Apparently, however, changes may be sometimes accepted from a Tory Government, but never from a Liberal Government; so Ireland finds herself in this dilemma, that when a Tory Government is in power no considerable reform can be enacted because a section of the Ulster Members claim the power to veto any beneficent work taken up by the Government, while on the other hand, when the Liberals are in power nothing can be done to improve the Administration in Ireland because it might lead up to Home Rule. Thus the result comes to be that nothing at all is to be done for Ireland by either party. The name of Home Rule has no terrors for me. I was a Home Ruler before 1886, and I have never departed in the smallest particular from any of the principles for which we of the Liberal party fought when Mr. Gladstone led us in 1886 and 1893. Therefore I approach this subject in the firm belief, which I think is shared by the great majority of the House, that changes, and indeed important changes, are needed in the government of Ireland. I have been asked what changes it is proposed to make. His Majesty's Speech says that plans are under consideration; and while we are considering the nature and scope of the plans that ought to be adopted, ought we to be asked to state the precise point at which we have arrived before we have completed our consideration? The House is not even in the First Reading of a Bill, and I decline to have the freedom and deliberation which we require for exploring and studying this great subject interfered with by replying to the somewhat unreasonable demand that is now addressed to us. Let me, however, return to the suggestion that changes in the method of governing Ireland are not needed. Let me quote what was said by Lord Lansdowne in the House of Lords a year ago. He said that any one who had studied the question was aware that there was room for considerable improvement in that old-fashioned and complicated organisation. The late Prime Minister also spoke of the need for changes in Ireland. And what is the record of the Tory Government during the last sixteen years upon this subject? Older Members will remember that the late Lord Salisbury once made a speech in which he declared that to give local government to Ireland was more dangerous than Home Rule. A very few years afterwards the Tory Party passed a Local Government Bill; and, by the confession of one Member on the other side who spoke on this subject to-night, that Local Government Act has worked very well. And how about the Land Bill of 1903? I suppose the failure of Mr. Gladstone's scheme in 1886 was as much due to the objections entertained to that Bill as to the objections to the Home Rule Bill. Certainly that was stated by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham and others. In 1903 a Land Bill involving more than 110 millions of British credit was passed by a Conservative Government. Contemporaneously with that the then Viceroy (Lord Dudley) and the right hon. Member for Dover inaugurated a new policy, and the then Viceroy actually said that in his view Ireland ought to be governed in accordance, not with

English, but with Irish, ideas. The right hon. Member for Dover appointed as Under-Secretary a most distinguished ex-Indian Civil servant with the very object and purpose of helping him to effect changes in the Government of Ireland. It is clear that the Viceroy, at all events, was cognisant of and approved what Sir A. MacDonnell was doing. The Member for Dover retired, but the Viceroy remained. Can any one deny that the action of His Majesty's late Government, in allowing the Viceroy to continue to represent them in Ireland —knowing what had been done, and after the sympathy and encouragement which the Viceroy most properly and reasonably and candidly had given to the scheme of the Irish Reform Association—constituted in itself an admission by the late Government that large changes are needed in the Government of Ireland? We know what changes have taken place in Ireland itself. The rise of the Irish Reform Association is a most significant fact. You have men who belong to the Conservative Party, who have always supported it by their votes, landlords themselves, men of local influence and weight, who have joined in this movement for improving the government of Ireland; and you have a further significant fact in the adhesion of a former Under-Secretary, Sir West Ridgeway, to that policy, reminding us of the influence produced upon the mind of a former Under-Secretary by his experience in Ireland, because it was what he saw in Dublin Castle that made Sir R. Hamilton a Home Ruler. These signs of a change of opinion in Ireland are not confined to the south and the west; they are visible in Ulster also. We have had the most significant fact of the return of the hon. Member for North Antrim to this House—a constituency which, as far as I can recollect, has ever since 1885 been consistently on the Tory side. In fact, I am not going too far when I say that everybody in Ireland admits that changes are needed in the Irish Government. [Cries of "No."]

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): May I point out that the Ulster Unionist Party have gained two seats and lost one.

Mr. BRYCE: With all these facts before us, with the record of the late Government, with all this evidence of change, it would be impossible for us not to address ourselves to the problem of what can be done to improve the government of Ireland. I do not really see how it is possible for Members of the late Government to vote for this Amendment. Their own conduct stares them in the face. They were parties to measures for improving the Government of Ireland, and this Amendment in effect says that no change in the Government of Ireland ought to be made. Still less am I able to understand how the right hon. Member for West Birmingham can vote for it. Reference has been made to a well-known book called "The Radical Programme," containing views approved by him, published in 1885. But in 1886, after the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, the right hon. Gentleman said he "had always been a Home Ruler." The other night the right hon. Gentleman said he and his Party would always give strenuous opposition to self-government for Ireland. Just in the same way he formerly said "I have always been a Home Ruler." "Always" is a word which comes easily to his lips. If hon. Members will refer to the "Life of Gladstone" by my right hon. friend the Member for Montrose, they will find on page 367 of Vol. III. an extremely interesting account of the views which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham entertained in 1887 after the Home Rule Bill of 1886 had been defeated, and in an interview which the right hon. Gentleman had in 1898 with Mr. Barry O'Brien (described in his very interesting "Life of Parnell," Vol. II., p. 134) he expressed himself as having been in favour of a national council in Dublin, with perhaps another council in Belfast, and he described his own projects for giving to a central council the administrative work of all the boards then existing in Dublin, and, further, suggested that this board might, besides, deal with such subjects as land, education, etc. Now the right hon. Gentleman, in referring to those relatively youthful opinions of his—and in this case second thoughts are perhaps worse thoughts—said that he would not say exactly the same thing now. But surely most people will come to the conclusion that what it was safe to give in 1885, or 1886, or 1887, might be far more safely given now. How great has been the change in the condition of the country! Between 1880 and 1885 the number of reported outrages per annum had frequently exceeded 4,000. The number of reported outrages per annum has, during the last few years, been sometimes below and usually little above 200. Other difficulties in the way of an extension of self-government upon which people dwelt in those days have also been removed. Local Government has been established and is working well, a Land Purchase Bill has been passed, the land is passing into the hands of the tenants, there is far less boycotting, there is very little intimidation—wherever you look the condition of the country as regards peace and tranquillity has notably improved; and that which was safe in the view of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in 1887 must surely be far safer and easier now. Accordingly, His Majesty's Government have every possible reason for making an effort in the direction of improving the system of government in Ireland and in associating the people with it. Many reasons have been advanced at different times for moving in that direction. Those who can recall that memorable day when Mr. Gladstone, in a House crowded as it was never crowded before, brought in his Home Rule Bill in 1886, will remember that the point on which he chiefly dwelt as making self-government necessary was its tendency to promote and secure social order. He said that until you give the people confidence in the Government and give them some measure of responsibility for it you will not place upon a firm and permanent basis social order in Ireland. I am happy to think that although that Bill failed to pass, its results have not been lost, and social order is far better preserved now, just because the people have come to know that they have much sympathy and friendship from the people of Great Britain. Another reason advanced for giving the management of their local affairs to the Irish people was that devolution would relieve the Imperial Parliament of functions which were beginning to overburden it. That argument is still a very weighty and important one, as the new Members of this House, when they see how much its work exceeds its means for despatching that work, will come to realise. But there is a third argument, which was not then so familiar to most of us, but which has forced itself upon my mind every day that I have had to do with the administration of the government of Ireland, and it is this, that there are many reforms in Irish administration which urgently need to be effected, but which cannot be properly effected unless you enlist, on their behalf, the opinion and sentiment of the people of Ireland. I am not sure that this is not as important an argument as the others. For instance, there is an immense deal to be done for Irish education. Its condition is half a century behind that of education in England and Scotland. But I see little prospect of effecting the needed reforms unless you can carry the opinion of the Irish people with you. The way to carry the opinion of the Irish people with you, is, if possible, to give them some direct voice in considering, some direct part in carrying out, these reforms. And in carrying out these reforms by administration you must associate the people with the work of governing themselves if you are to make these reforms palatable and acceptable to them. You must give them a sense of responsiblity for the laws by which they are to be governed. You must give them opportunities of dealing with practical questions in a practical spirit. You must enable them to come together from different parts of Ireland as citizens of the same country, not necessarily divided by Party lines or conducting their discussions in a Party spirit, but endeavouring to work together as patriotic Irishmen for the good of their common country. That is, perhaps, what is most needed in Ireland at present—to give the people of all sections and of both faiths an opportunity of coming together and working together. It is because I believe that it would check and give the greatest possible discouragement to the policy of conciliation and to that development of self-government which Ireland needs that I ask the House to reject this Amendment. I do not believe that the sentiments of the vast majority of Irishmen approve of this Amendment. If the apprehensions which the Amendment sets forth are still cherished, they are cherished by a small and dwindling minority. They are the sentiments of a small section which is steeped in old-fashioned prejudices, unworthy of enlightened minds, and, unfortunately, has formed the habit of appealing to and inflaming racial and religious animosities—animosities which would die out of themselves if they were allowed to do so. If those who here profess to speak for that small section will allow me to say so without offence, I am heartily sorry that they should still cherish sentiments which keep them apart from the main body of their fellow countrymen. But though this is still their attitude, there is a spirit of conciliation at this moment growing and spreading in Ireland. There is a general wish to let bygones be bygones. In Ulster, as elsewhere, there is a disposition to regard with new eyes and in a candid temper the differences which have kept Irishmen apart, and to find a solution for the difficulties with which Ireland is confronted. The hon. Member for Waterford said, in the eloquent speech which he delivered two nights ago, that this new Parliament had a great opportunity. Yes, Sir, it has a great opportunity before it. This is not merely because the people of England and Scotland, when every possible effort was made to frighten and deter them, have, at the recent general election, declared in favour of a policy of conciliation and of the extension of self-government, and have delivered their authority to the House of Commons to carry out that policy. That is one reason. But this opportunity has also another aspect. When Ireland is tranquil, when the people are disposed to accept in a friendly spirit what comes to them from Great Britain, when so great a change has come over the spirit of both Ireland and Great Britain since 1886, surely that is the moment at which measures looking further towards self-government can properly be introduced. It used to be said, and it was said, I am afraid with fatal effect, in 1886, that while Ireland was so disturbed and crime was so rife, how can you give the people the right to control their own affairs? That argument, at any rate, has been now removed. This is a moment of tranquility, of peace, and of comparatively well settled order. Seize that precious opportunity, seize it while you can. There is also another reason. When the majority which supports His Majesty's Government is so large as it is now, no charge of mere Party motives in proposing concessions to the wishes of Ireland can be brought against us. Such a charge would be unjust. What we said and tried to do in 1886 was done honestly, done from conviction, done because we had learned from experience how much was needed in order to improve the relations of the two islands. But were we to be now neglectful of what we have continually declared and avowed during the last nineteen years, we should justly expose ourselves to the charge of having advocated these principles from Party motives. The fact that there is in this House, fresh from its contact with the nation, so large a majority pledged to support the policy outlined in the Speech from the Throne is a strong reason why we should advance steadily and fearlessly, knowing that no charges such as were brought before can now be brought against our action. But I do not call what we hope to do by the name of "a concession to Ireland." I do not say it ought to be done for the sake merely of meeting the demands made by Ireland, although it is surely a most impressive fact that the majority of Members from Ireland who ask for an extension of self-government has continued to be the same for twenty years, and that, whereas nearly all of us in England and Scotland have had to fight for our seats, a great deal more than half the Irish Nationalist Members [NATIONALIST cries of "seventy" and "eighty"] have come back to Parliament unopposed. A demand like that, preferred with such a weight of popular opinion, is a demand which no constitutional Government can disregard. No, Sir, the reforms which ought to be granted must be granted not solely because Ireland asks for them and needs them. They will be for the advantage of Great Britain no less than for the advantage of Ireland. Ireland has been the principal source of weakness to Great Britain ever since 1782, and she ought to be a part of the strength of the United Kingdom. That Ireland should be peaceful, that Ireland should be a contented member of the United Kingdom, that the prosperity of Ireland should be part of the prosperity of the United Kingdom, that the youth of Ireland, whose intelligence and energy make them valuable and successful colonists wherever they go over the face of the earth, should be induced to stay at home in Ireland and devote their energies to the progress of their own country, to which the Irish people are attached as no people whose annals history records have ever been more attached—these are the aims to which not only Irish patriots, but every British Party and every British Government may well devote its efforts, and in devoting its efforts to those aims, I hope that it will earn and will deserve the blessing promised to the peacemakers.

*MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): The House has just listened to a speech which was unquestionably eloquent and which has naturally commanded its earnest attention. But I venture to say that as an answer to the requests made by those who are naturally anxious to know what the intentions of the Government are, it has not only failed to satisfy their natural curiosity, but has erred in another direction. The right hon. Gentleman began by telling us what, I may say, those of us who had followed this controversy were already aware of, namely, that he had been for many years—from the commencement of this question—an earnest advocate of Home Rule. Then he delivered a speech in which he commenced by declining, as he was entitled to decline, to divulge the proposals of the Government, because they were not yet completely prepared. Afterwards, however, he went on to make a speech which one would naturally have expected to be followed up by a declaration that those proposals tended towards Home Rule itself. There was not one of his arguments which was not used by the great leader of the Liberal Party who, standing at that box, proposed two schemes in favour of Home Rule, not being afraid to give to those arguments their legitimate and logical conclusion. He was not content to stop short as the right hon. Gentleman has done to-night and take refuge in schemes for the amendment of the Education Department in Ireland, of the Board of Public Works, and of others of the various Boards which with some exaggeration, if also with some truth, have been described as being too numerous and not altogether as useful as they might be. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that it is necessary to effect some reforms in Ireland; and I should be the last to deny, if the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne referring to these particular questions stood by itself, that there was great justification for them, and I should for myself have said that I did not believe it would be necessary to move an Amendment to the Address in consequence of the insertion of this particular paragraph. But my right hon. and gallant friend and those who have supported him in this debate were bound, when considering that paragraph, to have regard not only to its contents, but to the circumstances which followed and the circumstances which preceded its production. They have reminded the House of what the right hon. Gentleman has so candidly and frankly told them; they knew that the Prime Minister had at Stirling made definite declarations in regard to his own opinions in reference to Home Rule; they knew that other leading members of the Administration, including the Chief Secretary himself, had been advocates since 1885 of these reforms in Irish Government. Are they therefore to be blamed as the right hon. Gentleman sought to blame them in the commencement of his speech, because they have asked to be told what this paragraph means? Does it mean that the reforms which he said he would not indicate to us because they were not prepared are reforms only in local administration, in education——

MR. BRYCE: I did not say that.

*MR. WALTER LONG: So I understood him.

MR. BRYCE: I did not use any words of limitation.

*MR. WALTER LONG: We get our information by degrees. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has any right to complain of the Amendment having been moved, or to blame us for pressing, as we have endeavoured to do, our interrogations. What are the words of the Speech? They are that His Majesty's Ministers have under consideration, plans, etc. The right hon. Gentleman, referring to those plans, says: "How can I tell what they are before I have considered the matter," but he went on to say that in education, in public works, and in other matters there was room for great improvement. Yes, undoubtedly there is room for great economies. Reforms can be made and economy can be effected without in the slightest degree trenching upon what we regard as the foundation of the Union. [An HON. MEMBER: Why did *you* do it?] I will answer that directly. We are entitled, I think, at this stage of the proceedings to know whether the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues mean, as his speech seems to indicate, to adopt the policy of the Prime Minister—the policy of Home Rule by instalments, or whether they mean to deal with the question as it was dealt with by Mr. Gladstone after speeches identical in character with the speech we have just heard from the Chief Secretary. We are bound, as I have said, to regard this paragraph, not only from the point of view of its exact contents, but in connection with the circumstances in which it was produced, and we are justified from that point of view in some, at all events, of the suspicions we entertain. I confess I have great admiration for the ingenuity of the framer of the paragraph; because we have seen in the debate which has taken place that the paragraph has been so skilfully worded that it has commanded the support of those who have declared themselves, unlike the Chief Secretary and the Prime Minister, as being altogether opposed to Home Rule and those who have been consistently in favour of Home Rule for more than twenty years. It is this peculiar vagueness which makes it necessary that we should know more about it. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the action of the Unionist Party in regard to reform. The Prime Minister, indeed, reminded us the other night that in his opinion the conduct of our own Party in giving Ireland a measure of local government justified some further measures in that direction. How it can be maintained that the establishment of local government in Ireland justifies measures which lead to extended self-government, passes my comprehension. The Irish Local Government Act was founded on the basis of the English and Scottish Acts, and if the Irish Act is to be taken as a foundation for a claim for Home Rule, what is to be said on behalf of England and Scotland, and the rest of the United Kingdom? [Cheers and counter cheers.] If I am right in assuming from the cheers of hon. Members opposite that a programme of Home Rule all round is to be the policy of the new Government, at all events they are not lessening, but rather adding to, the length of their programme and to the number of difficulties with which they will have to deal. We are bound also to have some regard to the administration of the Irish Government as an indication of the line which that Government propose to take. I do not propose to dwell upon the fact that they have divested themselves of their powers under the Crimes Act, or altered the regulations for the Estates Commissioners. I only refer to these two matters to show that the Government have indicated their desire to do what we all desire to do if we can do so with safety and propriety—namely, to govern the country without the aid of extra laws, and to govern it in conformity with the wishes, or at all events with the support, of the people of the country. But let me remind the right hon. Gentleman that he is not the first Minister who has made this experiment with equal honesty and an equally earnest desire to serve Ireland. Probably no Minister ever went to Ireland with a more generous desire to serve that country than did the late Mr. Forster. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh!"] Mr. Forster began by showing his strong desire to govern Ireland on humane and generous principles, but difficulties overcame him and made the task for him impossible. I personally will certainly never say or do anything which I can avoid calculated to add in any degree to the difficulties which the right hon. Gentleman has to face. On the contrary, although I believe that the right hon. Gentleman may yet find that he has perhaps with undue haste deprived the Executive of powers which he requires, I need hardly say—and I am sure I can say it with general acceptance—that I desire as heartily as any man in the House that the right hon. Gentleman may find his efforts crowned with success and that he will not need the extra powers which he has abandoned. My right hon. and gallant friend, however, was bound to have regard to these general circumstances when he put on the Paper the Amendment which is now under consideration. Those Members who desire to put the case for the Union in the forefront are entitled to ask what are the objects which the Government has in view. The hon. Member for South Tyrone and others have said that, although the late general election was taken upon other questions, we on this side of the House brought the maintenance of the Union to the front, and that that question was one upon which the election was fought. I do not believe that anybody out of Ireland who went through the late general election will confirm that as an accurate representation of the facts. [Cries of "Oh!" and "What did you say at Bristol?"] What I said at Bristol does not settle the question at all. [AN HON. MEMBER: Bristol settled you.] It was what was said elsewhere.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: My statement was founded on the election address of the late Prime Minister.

*MR. WALTER LONG: I maintain that throughout the whole election in England and, I believe, in Scotland, when the question of the Union was raised it was stated, as the hon. Member for Waterford stated in his speech the other night, that we were raising a bogey which had no existence. We were told that Home Rule was a bogey in the sense that there was no intention on the part of the Liberal Government to introduce Home Rule. And when you say that this question was raised and that we have no right to declare that a mandate was not given for Home Rule, our answer is that Member after Member—it would be quite easy to ascertain how many—in their haste and desire to be returned to Parliament—[Cries of "Oh, oh!"]—I imagine that they were anxious to be returned to Parliament—[AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Bench. "What about yourself?"]—almost without exception they declared that if returned to Parliament they would not vote for a Home Rule Bill. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] We have heard to-night from the Labour Members that they did not make that declaration, but I appeal to the House whether it is not the case that in a great majority of instances it was asserted that the election was being fought not on Home Rule but on Free Trade. That statement was made by candidate after candidate and by some who declared that they stood as Unionists with Liberal principles. It is not fair, therefore, to come here and tell us that you have received a mandate to deal with the Home Rule question. I would have been prepared to regard the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne as perfectly harmless. I see in these words no indication of Home Rule, but only the suggestion of reforms for which there is a great deal to be said. If these words meant what is called devolution, then I confess that my view of them would be very different. As I understand it there are two kinds of reform. There is the form indicated by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, who has in view the lessening of the number of boards and the centralising of control. Whether that would meet with the acceptance of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway I am not prepared to say; but if it were carried out in its entirety it would be the application to Ireland of a system which had been developed in India, and would have the effect of centralising more than is now the case all authority in Dublin Castle. That system has always been condemned and criticised by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway; and therefore it must naturally arouse suspicion amongst Unionists when we find proposals of this kind are received with so much enthusiasm by Gentlemen below the gangway, and when those who have been returned to Parliament as Home Rulers receive these proposals with open arms, believing that they are steps in the direction in which they want to go. We on this side of the House are prepared to support reforms which would have the effect of securing economy and better administration, if these could not be held to be steps in the direction of Home Rule. We have asked to-night for some information which would enable us to judge how far this is the case; but I confess that we have received very little. We have heard from the right hon. Gentleman a speech which, if anything, means that the policy he announced would lead up to Home Rule. Are we not entitled to know whether that is the real intention of His Majesty's Ministers or not? If it is not, if the Government have imposed upon themselves a self-denying ordinance in that respect—that they do not intend to proceed to Home Rule, but that their proposition is so to reform the government of Ireland as to stop short of Home Rule, why, I ask, should not the House have some opportunity of examining the right hon. Gentleman's proposals and considering what bearing they would have on the government of Ireland? [An Hon. Member on the Ministerial Bench: So you will.] It is quite evident from the debate to-night that there are differences of opinion as to what may or may not lead up to Home Rule. There are no differences of opinion in the Unionist Party as to what Home Rule is. As defined by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, it means a separate executive, responsible to a separate Parliament. We know that that is the object which the hon. and learned Gentleman has in view, but is that the object of the Government? Below that there are reforms which may be wise and beneficial, but which will not in any way affect this great and Imperial question. I ask the right hon. Gentleman to take us into his confidence, although not necessarily at this stage. I accept the right hon. Gentleman's statement that his schemes are not yet matured, and that until they are matured he cannot lay them before the House; but I ask him whether he does not think it fair that the House should be made aware of them before they are finally adopted. We make no apology for having raised this question on the Address. It is very difficult to know what the words to which the Amendment calls attention mean, and we Unionists are only anxious that their meaning should be made clear. If it be true, as some of us fear, that the Government have taken some steps in the direction of Home Rule, it will be the duty of Unionists resolutely to oppose them. It is quite true that hon. Gentlemen opposite have returned in increased numbers, and that many of the old supporters of the Union are no longer amongst us. But the fight for the Union will have to be sustained by a small band. We Unionists are prepared to help the right hon. Gentleman in a genuine reform of Irish government and better administration, though not in the direction of Home Rule. If, however, when we know more than the right hon. Gentleman has told us to-night, we find that his proposals tend in the direction of Home Rule, then he may rely upon it that we shall offer the most strenuous and vigorous opposition to what will not be for the real improvement of the government of Ireland, but which will weaken the foundations on which the Union rests.

MR. DILLON said he wished to congratulate the Unionists of Ulster on their new Leader, who was a man eminently gifted to inspire his Party in the hour of defeat. The Unionists of Ireland had to-night raised a clear issue, from the decision of which he hoped and trusted they would not run away. Judging by some of the observations of the right hon. Member for South Dublin, he was disposed to think that the late Chief Secretary indicated a desire to make a strategic movement to the rear. It was interesting to note that before the polling took place at the general election every platform in the country rang with appeals to save the Union. Why, a whole sheet of the *The Times* was devoted to such an appeal on the eve of the election, and so great, so important, was this issue considered, that the appeal was made in large and capital letters to the manhood of England to rally to the support of the Unionist Party. What were the great issues put before the country by *The Times*? The first was to save the Union; but after the Manchester election the country heard no more about that appeal. He hoped that the late Chief Secretary's strategic movement to the rear would not be followed by an ignominious flight from the Amendment. He was proud and rejoiced that the first vote of this new Parliament would be given on the Irish Question, and that England, and indeed the whole world, would learn to-morrow what the new House of Commons thought of the claim of Ireland for self-government. He felt as one who had emerged from the atmosphere of an hospital in which he had been too long confined into the open day. Those who sat in the last Parliament must remember that day by day they had seen this great assembly degraded to impotence and treated with contempt until discussion ceased to be of interest to serious men. Debates were a weariness to the spirit; it was like listening to discussion on shadows. He was glad to believe that the decadence of the House of Commons in the public esteem, apparent under the last Government, had been arrested, and that once again they had in the House men who were in earnest and meant business. If he read the signs of the times aright, he believed that the interest in the proceedings of the House would not decrease, but would increase as the session went on. What was the real issue raised by the Amendment? What were the words in the King's Speech mainly challenged by the Amendment? They were told in that Speech that the present Government were considering means for associating the Irish people with the conduct of their own affairs. He and his friends accepted those words as a broad declaration of principle; they were satisfied with them from the point of view that the Irish people were to be associated in the conduct of their own affairs. They were quite prepared to give the Government reasonable time to work out the details of the manner in which that principle was to be carried out. After the disappointments of the last twenty-five years Irish Members might naturally be a little suspicious of the promises of Governments; but the speech delivered to-night by the right hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland was a great speech, and an honest speech. The tone of sincerity was apparent in it from beginning to end. He might be pardoned for saying that he thought the Chief Secretary had acquired inspiration from the air of his native land, for after all, although the right hon. Gentleman was of Scottish descent, he was born in Ireland, and, in going back to the land which gave him birth, he had gained inspiration and the power to move the House of Commons as he had never been able to move it before. After all the excellent advice the Irish Members had received from the Unionists and from *The Times* to press the Government in regard to their Irish proposals, he would say to the Government, that so long as they adhered to the spirit of the speech of the right hon. the Chief Secretary they would find in the Irish party—old and tried politicians—practical men, reasonable men, men not difficult to deal with, men with whom it was easy to carry on a transaction so long as they were convinced that those with whom they were dealing were honest and in earnest. After twenty years of resolute government and of struggle it would be a strange thing if they were to quarrel with a Government which had an overwhelming majority and was thoroughly sympathetic with the demands of the Irish Party. They would not be guilty of any such childish conduct. They would allow the Government time to develop their plans, and when their plans were developed the Irish Members would give them frank and careful consideration. While the Irish Party claimed to exercise the liberty of criticising the Government plans when they were produced, and also of criticising the administration of Ireland during the interval which must elapse between now and the introduction of the Government scheme, they would do so in no spirit of hostility and with no desire to embarrass, because they believed that this Government were honestly desirous of giving to the Irish people full and free control over purely Irish affairs. If he were disposed to criticise the King's Speech he could have done so in some particulars. There was no mention of an amending Land Act. The present position was an eminent danger both to the future solvency of the Irish people and to the Imperial Exchequer. There was no reference in the Speech to Irish education, although he recognised that the Chief Secretary had referred to the appalling injury which had been inflicted on the Irish people by the neglect of education in all its branches in that country. The lesson which he wished to drive home to the minds of the friendly audience which he saw opposite was that they had a Chief Secretary, new to his task, but profoundly impressed with the ruinous condition of Irish education. The Chief Secretary had admitted that he thought it would be almost impossible to tackle this task, and he questioned whether the right hon. Gentleman was not right, for he thought that it was not possible for this House to reorganise Irish education. Therefore, he believed it was the duty of this House to give the Irish people the power of doing it themselves, and to lay upon them the responsibility of looking after their own affairs. He urged the Government to bring in a Bill as soon as possible to amend the Land Act, that being a matter of vital interest to the Irish people; but, pending that legislation, he wished to impress on the Chief Secretary the necessity of overhauling the whole administration of the existing Act. Already a good deal had been done in that direction by the new instructions given to the Estates Commissioners. The Government ought not to lose an hour in remedying the atrocious condition of things under which the population of Roscommon, Galway, and Mayo were crowded on to the poorest land, unfit for human occupation, while the extensive and rich grasslands were swept clean of population and given up to cattle. If compulsion were necessary to effect a remedy, then the Government should introduce a Bill to confer compulsory powers upon the Congested Districts Board to obtain these grasslands at a reasonable valuation in order to relieve this urgent and most intense distress. The Government were pledged to rule Ireland according to Irish ideas, but, in his opinion, it was absolutely impossible with their present machinery to carry out that policy. There was no proper constitutional machinery by which the Executive could be informed of Irish ideas in a proper way; but, in making the attempt to redeem their pledge, he hoped the Government would seek to ascertain Irish ideas through the proper channels. He rejoiced to observe that the Government had put in the forefront of the King's Speech the question of the Irish labourers, and, in dealing with it, he would urge the Chief Secretary to be bold. He need not anticipate any opposition. The question was a non-contentious one so far as the Irish Members were concerned, and, if the right hon. Gentleman dealt with it in a generous and bold way he would do much to popularise his own Government in Ireland and to reconcile the Irish people to patience in waiting for his larger proposals. Then they had a pledge that the Government would submit on a future occasion proposals to associate the people of Ireland with the Government of their own country. It would be an act of folly if the Irish Party tried to force the hand of the Government without giving time for those proposals to mature. They would reserve their right to criticise those proposals, but they would give the Government fair time to complete them. They took up this attitude all the more firmly because they were deeply convinced that when it came to the test of practice and debate it would be found that there was no way of associating the Irish people in the control of their own affairs except by an elected body and some form of executive responsible to that body. They were glad on this occasion to be able to go into the Lobby in association with the new Party, and he was pleased that the first vote registered by the present Parliament would be upon an Irish question.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member for East Mayo expressed at the commencement of his remarks a fear least we should run away from the Amendment which has been proposed on this side of the House. He need have no fear of the kind. We shall certainly go into the lobby, and he is quite right in anticipating that we shall have what for some time to come may be described as the usual majority against us. We merely wish to register our opinion, to make our position clear to the House and to the country, and we care not one brass farthing what is the exact amount of the majority against us. We are a hundred, more or less. We represent something considerably more than 2,000,000 of votes. How long it will be before the views which have given our political opponents so enormous a majority in this House are changed I do not know. Meanwhile, we shall continue to represent a force and influence in this country which is altogether disproportionate to our force and influence in this House. The object of this Amendment is clear. We do not expect in a new House, come in, no doubt, with already convinced opinions, to make many converts. It is intended merely to register and to make clear the issues which divide us; and we find now, as we shall find, I am convinced, very frequently during the course of the next few weeks and months, that the issues as they appear in this House after the election are very different from the issues as they appeared before and during the election. The hon. Member who has just sat down commenced by saying that the striking feature of our position in the election was that from every platform there went forth an appeal against this doctrine of Home Rule, against the possibility of once more bringing separation of the United Kingdom to the front. I do not think that is exactly accurate. But I am content to accept it as, at all events, the opinion of the hon. Member, who went on to say that it was the first issue at the election which has just taken place.

MR. DILLON: I did not say that. What I said was that I had in my possession a copy of *The Times* published on the eve of the Manchester election, in which it was stated that in their opinion it was the first issue.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not deny it at all. *The Times* is entitled to its own opinion and to place its own estimate on the importance of the different issues raised. It can stand upon its own independent merits and conclusions. But the hon. Member went much further than that. He distinctly told the House that a principal issue—I will not insist, if he objects, on the words "a first issue"—of the election through which we have just gone was the question of Home Rule—[MINISTERIAL cries of "No"]—raised, as he says, not by the Party opposite, but by the Party which is represented on this side of the House. I only ask you to remember that when we come to discuss other questions that divide us, when you tell us you sit there in the enormous majority you enjoy because you are free-traders, you will permit us to remind you that you sit there in your enormous majority, in the opinion of the hon. Member for East Mayo, because you are Home Rulers. I should not myself be inclined to press either conclusion. You sit there, no doubt, because of your virtues and our depravity; but, after all, there is only this table between us, and it may not be so long as you think before we again exchange positions. But, meanwhile, I want to call attention to the fact that, whatever was said on this side with regard to the question now under discussion, it was to the effect that the Government that was appealing to the support of the electors was a Home Rule and Little England Government. It is proved to-night that you are a Home Rule Government, and it will, I have no doubt, be proved shortly that you are a Little England Government. No wonder that the hon. Member for East Mayo is exulting. What does he say? He says—

> "At last we have a Government which is in earnest and means business, and we have listened to a 'brave' speech from the Chief Secretary."

What business? ["Not protection."] We are not discussing protection or South Africa; when the hon. Member says the Government means business, he means Home Rule. Well, I agree with him. During my own canvass, if I may speak of so insignificant a matter, I denounced the Government as a Home Rule Government; but I thought it would have been an insult to the intelligence of my constituents to proceed with the old arguments against Home Rule, and did not do so during the election. But no doubt our general assertion was that support to the Government meant support to Home Rule. We agree, then, with the hon. Member for East Mayo; but still, what a funny kind of business it is! If they really mean business, why do they not bring in a Home Rule Bill? Why do they not do that? Oh, we all know why! because a number of Members on their side found it necessary during the election to pledge themselves to oppose a Home Rule Bill. What is at the bottom of this pledge it is not for me to say. I cannot look into the motives of men. It may be that hon. Gentlemen were sincere in their objections to Home Rule, or it may be that they thought Home Rule was unpopular, and they would prefer that their cherished Government should introduce Home Rule by instalments, or present it in some insidious form in which all its evil qualities would not be clearly displayed. Well, that is the position, and when the hon. Member for East Mayo congratulates and praises the Chief Secretary for his brave speech, I am reminded of the boa constrictor who—what shall I say—salves his prey before he devours it. [AN HON. MEMBER: The way you did with Balfour.] This is a new House of Commons. There are—I am delighted to know it—a great number of gentlemen here who are engaged in political work for the first time, and who have not had the lengthy, I might almost say the tedious, experience that we old stagers have had to endure. But amongst our experiences has been a long experience of the Irish Members. And we know what their "eloquence" means; and we know that their praise is perhaps a little more dangerous than their blame. Therefore, I am rather disposed to compassionate the Chief Secretary when he is so loudly praised by the hon. Member for East Mayo. I expect that before very long we may see the other side of the picture. But in the meantime the hon. Member for East Mayo rightly said, in my opinon—

> "The House of Commons has come back, in overwhelming majority, sympathetic with our view."

And yet, when we ventured humbly to suggest during the election that this question of Home Rule was not quite so dead as was supposed, and that we might have a Parliament returned to carry out the policy which "the predominant partner" has in the past emphatically condemned, we were told that this was a mere bogey of our own creation, and that we were drawing a red herring across the path in order to conceal private iniquities of our own. I do not think the Prime Minister can seriously contend that anything of that sort was fairly said, or can now, at any rate, be for a moment admitted. No, you will beat us with your big majority; and, as I have said, we shall accept our defeat with perfect good humour and absolute satisfaction. But you will have convinced the people of this country, if they had any doubt of it before, that whatever they may be, you—the overwhelming majority, you, the powerful Government of this country—are a Home Rule Government.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 406. (Division List No. 1).

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHnHughO.
Baring, Hn. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hon. Michael Hugh
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC.W.
Cecil, LordJ. Joicey-(Stamford)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Clarke, RtHnSirE.(CityLond.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles, C. (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert(Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonehaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'rH'lets)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, FWF.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Stavely (Staff'sh.)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants, Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt. Col. A.R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Meysey-Thompson, Major E.C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Eccleshall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford E.)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W.M.(Lanark N.W.
Thornton, Percy, M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, G.H. (Worcester)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. CB. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, G. (Ayr Burghs)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Gloucester)

Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W.C.B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. G.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hiliare Joseph PeterR.
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,SGeo,
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs., Leigh
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James(Aberdeen
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Right Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. R. Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin Charles Ramsay(Galw'y
Devlin, Joseph (Belfast, West)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, WH. (St. Pancras N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dodd, Denis H. S.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. M. (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hn. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Haman (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth, RL(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davis, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles Solomon
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman(Somers't, N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Dennis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund B. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.
McArthur William
McCrae, George

McKean, John
McKenna, Reginald
McKillop, W.
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallett, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alfred
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza-
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Right Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Moss, Samuel
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hara, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robartes, Hn T C Agar- (Bodmin
Roberts, C. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. E. (Manch'ster, N.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Stewart- (Kendal)
Smyth, Thomas (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, E. P. (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Methyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Som'rs't, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudly (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. Halifax
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Williams, W. L. (Carmarthen)
Williamson, A. (Elgin and Nairn
Wilson, C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. George Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising.

Motion made and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 22nd February, 1906.

Several Lords. Took the Oath.

Address. The King's Answer to the Address of Monday last reported; and Address and Answer to be printed and published.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Accrington District Gas and Water Board.

Additional Electrical Power Supply (London).

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting).

Bacup Corporation.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.

Barry Railway.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation).

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase).

Bridgewater Canals.

Bristol Corporation.

Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting).

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

Burry Port Gas and Improvement.

Bury Corporation.

Cambrian Railways.

Cardiff Gas.

Cardiff Railway.

Carlisle Corporation.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway.

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply.

Cheltenham Gas.

City of London Electric Lighting.

Clacton Urban District Council.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges).

Cork City Railways and Works.

Cork Link Railways.

Cork and Waterford Railways.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply.

Crediton Lighting and Power.

Crystal Palace Company.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.

Derby Gas.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power.

Dover Corporation.

Dover Harbour Board.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.).

Dowlais Gas.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway.

Epsom and Ewell Gas.

Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.

Fulwood Urban District Water.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).

Glamorgan and South Wales Water.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.

Great Eastern Railway.

Great Northern Railway.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways.

Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.

Hackney Electricity.

Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway.

Hampstead Garden Suburb.

Haslingden Corporation.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses.

Holyhead Water.

H. R. Baines and Company.

Huddersfield Corporation

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).

Hull Joint Dock.

Kent Collieries Electricity Supply.

Kent Electric Power.

Kettering Water.

Kidderminster Gas.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation.

Knott End Railway (Extension of Time).

Lancashire Electric Power.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund).

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.

Llandrindod Wells Gas.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.

London County Buildings.

London County Council (Electric Supply).

London County Council (General Powers).

London Electric Supply Corporation.

London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies.

London and North Western Railway.

London Outer Circle Railway.

London and South Western Railway.

London Southern Tramways

London Squares and Enclosures.

Macclesfield and District Tramways.

Manchester Churches.

Manchester Corporation.

Manchester and Milford Railway.

Maryport Harbour.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.

Mersey Railway.

Merthyr Tydfil Gas.

Metropolitan District Railway.

Metropolitan Electric Supply.

Metropolitan Railway.

Metropolitan Water Board.

Middlesex County Council (General Powers).

Midland Railway.

Mid-Oxfordshire Gas.

Milford Docks.

Millwall Dock.

Mirfield Gas.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company.

New Mills Urban District Council.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation).

Newport Corporation.

Newport Harbour Commissioners.

Newtownards Urban District Council.

North East Lincolnshire Water.

North East London Railway.

North Metropolitan Tramways.

North and South Shields Electric Railway.

North Sussex Gas and Water.

North West London Railway.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment).

Penllwyn Railway and Road.

Peterborough Gas.

Pontefract Corporation.

Portsmouth Water.

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas.

Rugby Subordinate School.

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement.

St. Pancras Electricity.

Sheffield Assay Office.

Sheffield District Railway.

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity.

Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time).

South Lincolnshire Water.

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power.

South Metropolitan Gas.

South Suburban Gas.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company.

Southampton Gas.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time).

Sutton Southcoates and Drypool Gas.

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time).

Thames Harbour.

Thornton Urban District Gas.

Todmorden Corporation.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas.

Trent Navigation Company.

Truro Gas.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply.

Uxbridge Gas.

Vauclain's Patent.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements

Wandsworth and Putney Gas (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge.

Watford and Edgware Railway.

Watford Gas.

West London Electric Undertakers' Association.

West Middlesex Roads.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board.

Wigan and Heysham Railway.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time).

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have not been complied with :

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay (Dover).

Heacham Water.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).

London United Tramways.

Middlesex County Council (Tramways).

Romford and District Tramways.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—I. (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3522. Cuba (Trade 1904 (Supplementary)).

No. 3523. Germany (German Trade with India).

No. 3524. Netherlands (Finances of the Netherland Indies).

No. 3525. Denmark (Trade 1904 (Supplementary)).

No. 3526. Germany (Bavaria).

No. 3527. Netherlands (Finances of the Netherlands).

No. 3528. France (Indo-China).

No. 3529. Servia (Trade 1904).

No. 3530. Italy (South Italy).

No. 3531. Mexico (Mexican Budget).

II. (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 643. United States (Coal Industry of the United States in 1904).

No. 644. France (Report on the French Octroi System).

TREATY SERIES, NO. 2 (1906).

Convention between United Kingdom and France respecting telegraphic communication between Mauritius and Réunion; signed at Paris, 6th December, 1905. (Ratifications exchanged at Paris, 10th January, 1906.)

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

Light railways in the borough of Great Grimsby and in the rural district of Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln (parts of Lindsey) from Great Grimsby to Immingham.

Light railways in the borough of Newark and in the rural district of Newark, in the county of Nottingham.

A light railway in the county of Chester, from Tarporley to a junction with the railway of the Cheshire Lines Committee near Mouldsworth.

Light railways in the urban district of Seaham Harbour and in the rural districts of Easington and of Sunderland, in the county of Durham.

II. Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of light railways in the borough of Bideford, and from Landcross to Clovelly and Hartland, all in the county of Devon.

PRISONS (INTERNATIONAL PENITENTIARY CONGRESS AT BUDA PESTH, 1905).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Sir E. Ruggles-Brise, K.C.B., Chairman of the Prison Commission for England and Wales, and British Delegate on the Proceedings of the Seventh International Penitentiary Congress held at Buda Pesth in 1905.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Annual Report of the Chief Inspectors of Factories and Workshops for the year 1904. Part II., Statistics.

ARMY.

(Military Manœuvres, 1906).—Draft Order in Council relative to Military Manœuvres, 1906.

(Army and Militia).—Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation, for the year ended September 30th, 1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ST. VINCENT.

Rules for the Government of the prison in St. Vincent.

TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS.

Rules and regulations for the administration of the Central Prison, Grand Turk.

SEAMEN'S SAVINGS BANKS (MONEY ORDERS, AND TRANSMISSION OF WAGES).

Account of all deposits received and repaid by the Board of Trade, on account of Seamen's Savings Banks, under the authority of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, during the year ended November 20th, 1905, and of the interest thereon; statement showing the number and amount of seamen's money orders, issued and paid at ports in the United Kingdom, and at ports abroad from 1855 to March 31st, 1905; also, statement showing the receipts and payments in connection with the transmission of seamen's wages, home and foreign, from 1878 to March 31st, 1905.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Order directing that the several Orders for the time being in force for regulating the proceedings of the boards of guardians, and the keeping and auditing of accounts, etc., shall, so far as the same are applicable thereto, govern the proceedings of the boards of managment of the district schools at Trim and Glin.

General order amending the Dispensing Rules.

COUNTY COURTS ENGLAND (FEES).

Treasury Order, dated February 22nd, 1906, amending the Order of December 30th, 1903, regulating court fees in county courts.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE FISCAL QUESTION.

*The Duke of DEVONSHIRE rose to ask His Majesty's Government "whether they will lay on the Table a Return of the imports and exports of the United Kingdom for the years 1903, 1904, and 1905, which are referred to in His Majesty's gracious Speech as showing a steady and accelerating increase, and any information showing the growing activity of trade at home and the sound and progressive condition of the industries of the country." His Grace said: My Lords, the Questions I have placed on the Paper, which, as your Lordships will have observed, relate to a paragraph in His Majesty's

Speech from the Throne, might perhaps more properly have been put in the course of the debate on the Address. But as I desired to make a few observations on the subject to which they refer, and as the discussion on the Address was entirely concerned with other matters, and as the state of the House after the Leaders had addressed it did not appear to indicate any desire on the part of your Lordships to enter upon a new subject of discussion, I thought that perhaps a more convenient course would be to postpone putting these Questions to another, but early, occasion.

I may be told, and very properly told, that the information which I ask His Majesty's Government to give is already, to a very great extent, accessible to Members of this House. No doubt that is perfectly true, if all of us knew exactly where to look for it. I quite admit that a good part of the information which I ask for on the subject of the Returns relating to our foreign trade are to be found in the publications of the Board of Trade, and most of us—at all events, those who pay much attention to the subject—are perfectly aware of the most salient points which are contained in those Returns. For instance, I suppose most of us are aware that the latest Returns of the Board of Trade show an increase in the imports of 1905 of £14,000,000 over those of 1904 and of £22,000,000 over those of 1903, while the exports of the year 1905 show an increase of £36,000,000 over those of 1904 and of £49,000,000 over those of 1903. No doubt these figures relating to our imports and exports perfectly justify the statement contained in the Speech from the Throne as showing "a steady and accelerating increase;" but I think it might be a great advantage if this, and perhaps some more detailed statement, could be laid on the Table of the House, arranged under the classification adopted by the Board of Trade, where the exports and imports are classified under the heads of food and drink, raw material, and manufactured goods.

I think it more than probable that the Board of Trade might be able to show us, in a perfectly simple and condensed form, the facts on which His Majesty's Government principally relied in advising the statement in the Speech; but I am also under the impression that, although the figures and statistics relating to our foreign trade are tolerably accessible to most of us, those which relate to the further statement in the paragraph as to "the growing activity of trade at home" and the sound and progressive condition of the industries of the country are not so easily accessible. I think it is quite possible that His Majesty's Government may be able to give us some interesting and useful information relating to these subjects.

I am not in any hurry to obtain this information, and the more so because I observe that in another place Mr. Chamberlain has announced his intention of putting a series of Questions to the Government relating to these Returns for the purpose, as he stated, of analysing them more fully and seeing their real purport and effect. I think Mr. Chamberlain anticipates somewhat more from the analysis which he proposes to institute of these Returns than he is likely to obtain. Mr. Chamberlain hopes that these Returns will enable us to understand how it is that this apparent prosperity should be accompanied by a state of things in which one-third of the whole population are underfed and on the verge of hunger. I am quite aware that this statement has frequently been made; but I do not know upon what authority it rests, and I doubt very much whether it can be shown that 13,000,000, or one-third of the population, are actually in the condition which is described. At all events, I am certainly under the impression that if, as is no doubt the case, the material condition of a large proportion of the population is not by any means satisfactory, that is not a condition of things which is at all tending to be worse, but that, on the contrary, the condition ef every portion of the population is better at the present time than it was a few or a large number of years since.

Mr. Chamberlain expects that he will be able to—

> "Discover from this analysis if, as we believe and have never denied, wealth is continally accumulating, why men decay."

Mr. Chamberlain has got first to prove that men are decaying in this country under the fiscal system which now exists.

> "If," he goes on, "more and more wealth is constantly accumulating, why is it the distribution appears to be so uneven?"

These questions, in my opinion, resolve themselves into one, and that is the question as to the unequal distribution of wealth in this country. I doubt very much whether any analysis, however perfect and complete, will afford an answer to this problem of the unequal distribution of wealth. That is a problem of the highest and greatest importance, and it is one of which, I have not a doubt, we shall in the course of this and succeeding sessions of Parliament hear a great deal. I have never supposed since the days of "Ransom" that Mr. Chamberlain would be in the least unwilling to enter into a discussion regarding the unequal distribution of wealth, and I think it is extremely probable that in the course of this and ensuing sessions he may find many opportunities of discussing this problem with some of the newly-returned Members of Parliament. But in all the discussions on this momentous subject which he may enter into with the Labour Members, I venture to express the opinion that he will find among the projects and plans which he will be called upon to discuss none containing a more Socialistic principle than that which is embodied in his own scheme, which, whether it can properly be described as a scheme of protection or not, is certainly a scheme under which the State is to undertake to regulate the course of commerce and of industry, and tell us where we are to buy, where we are to sell, what commodities we are to manufacture at home, and what we may continue, if we think right, to import from other countries.

I trust that His Majesty's Government will be willing to give the information which I have asked for; but I also hope that they will wait until they are able to receive assistance from Mr. Chamberlain's inquiries, which I have no doubt will tend greatly to elucidate and amplify the information for which I have asked. I am quite sure the objects which we have in view are the same—that our desire is that Parliament and the country should be placed in possession of the fullest and most complete information as to the present progressive state both of our foreign commerce and of our home industries.

The paragraph in His Majesty's Speech to which I have referred contains something in the nature of a challenge. The statement which is made as to the progressive state of both our commerce and our industries is directly in contradiction of the numerous assertions which in recent years we have heard from Members of both this House and the other House, who have asserted with equal force the exact contrary proposition, and have told us that our commerce and our industries, if not declining, are alike in a stationary and unprogressive state. I did not understand from the speech of my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition that he had any intention of taking up this challenge. I make no complaint of that. I do not know whether it is the intention of Mr. Chamberlain in the other House, when he obtains the information for which he has asked, to take any steps to take up this challenge. But I observe that, speaking in the City the other day, Mr. Balfour complained of the waste of valuable Parliamentary time which would be involved in giving a day or days for the discussion of the policy on which for the last three years he has been, as he told us, leading his Party. There is, however, a Member of your Lordships' House who, holding the position of Chairman of the Tariff Reform League, has devoted a great deal of time and labour to the investigation of the condition of our industries. That Commission has not yet issued a final Report, but it has issued a number of preliminary and sectional Reports, which I do not profess fully to have studied, but which, so far as I can gather, lead to entirely opposite conclusions to those which are stated in the Speech from the Throne. I do not know whether it is his intention, when he is in possession of the information which is to be obtained by Mr. Chamberlain, to ask your Lordships to enter into a further examination of the question; but no doubt your Lordships will be very glad to have an opportunity of attempting to arrive at exact and accurate conclusons with regard to this most important question.

Now, I desire to address a few observations to your Lordships not on any abstract aspect of this great and important question, but on the relation which it may have to the policy of the Unionist Party, which is so largely represented in your Lordships' House. My noble friend behind me referred the other day to the exceptional circumstances in which we find ourselves in this House. My noble friend did not speak in at all too strong terms of the great changes which have been brought about as a result of the late General Election. It is extremely probable that in this and subsequent sessions a great deal more public attention may be directed to the proceedings in your Lordships' House than has been the case in recent years.

During the last ten years the opinions on most political questions of the majority in both Houses have been in tolerably close agreement, and your Lordships have had little to do more than to give your assent to measures sent up from the other House, or to introduce comparatively unimportant Amendments in those measures. This position is now, as a result of the election, fundamentally altered. It cannot be denied that on most political questions the opinions of the majority of the House of Commons are not in harmony with, but are opposed to, the opinions held by the great majority of this House. That difference in the political opinions represented in the two Houses will no doubt, must no doubt, find its expression in the measures which will be sent to you from the other House of Parliament; and it will be for your Lordships and the leaders of this House to consider how far it may be wise, how far it may be prudent, how far it may be the duty of this House, to exercise its constitutional rights in relation to those measures. I feel perfectly confident that the advice which will be given to your Lordships' House will be wise and statesmanlike, and will be based to a very great extent on the wise and statesmanlike advice which on more than one occasion was given to this House by the late Lord Salisbury. But, in my opinion, a great deal depends, not only on the treatment of Bills that may come up from the other House, but on what may be the constructive policy adopted by the Unionist Party when at any future time it returns to power.

If, besides the differences that exist between us on the Irish question, on social questions, on Church questions, on questions of Parliamentary reform, the Unionist Party is going to be pledged to a constructive policy of fiscal reform which, whether it be right or whether it be wrong, appears at all events at the present time to be in opposition to the strong opinion of the majority of the country, then in my opinion the Unionist Party, which, as I have said, is so largely represented in this House, will find itself in the worst possible position if it desires to exercise any influence whatever on legislation in Parliament. If, as is not impossible, the question of Home Rule should be revived during the existence of the present Parliament, or if, as is more likely, it should be revived in anticipation of the next General Election, if there are any measures dealing with social questions which, in your Lordships' opinion, require a more definite expression of the feeling of the country, if, as a consequence of possible disagreements between the two Houses of Parliament, the constitutional rights of this House are ever threatened, in my opinion you will find yourselves in the weakest position which you could occupy if the Unionist Party finds itself committed to a policy which either is a policy of protection or with any plausibility can be represented as a policy of protection.

If I may give an example of what I am trying to point out, I will give you the example of the Home Rule Bill of 1893. In that year your Lordships were able, almost without protest or murmur from the greater part of this country, to reject by an enormous majority a measure which had been passed by a majority in the other House. You were able to do that because you believed, and, as the event proved, rightly believed, that you were supported by the great body of public opinion in the country, but I ask you to consider whether you would have appealed with the same confidence to the opinion of the country if in 1893 your opposition to Home Rule had to be combined with the advocacy of a policy of constructive fiscal reform? If you really expect that the adoption of this policy is going to strengthen you in the country, if you think it is going to make you stronger, then no doubt you will be justified, not only in principle, but in policy, in persevering with that policy; but nobody can say that in the recent general election there appeared any probability of a sudden conversion on the part of the country to a policy of fiscal reform. I do entreat your Lordships to consider very carefully whether you are justified in policy, however you may be in principle, in linking the cause of the Union or other causes which are dear to a majority in this House to the cause of another policy which, whether it be right or whether it be wrong, not one of your Lordships three years ago imagined for a moment was a question of present practical politics.

There is still time for your Lordships to consider your position in regard to this question. Up to now, although some of us have complained of a toleration, not to say the complicity, of members of the late Government with the policy advocated by the Tariff Reform League, the Party itself, the Unionist Party itself, has, as a whole, never been committed to anything beyond the vague expression of a desire for retaliation as a means for negotiation, or to equally vague expressions of a desire for something that might bring about a closer fiscal union with our Colonies. I am not going to trouble your Lordships with quotations at any length; but we have had from my noble friend the late Leader of the House as declarations on this subject of a most categorical character which I should like to bring to your notice. In February, 1904, my noble friend said in the course of debate in this House—

> "I say categorically we as a Government—and we cannot speak except as a Government—are opposed to a duty on raw material and food stuffs. Why is it we are told that our policy leads inevitably down an inclined plane to the Birmingham abyss? I say it does not and that on the contrary it is a self-contained policy, and it is quite within our power to stop short. . . . It is a self-contained policy, and I believe that instead of leading to Birmingham it leads, if anywhere, in an opposite direction."

That is a categorical declaration made by the late Leader of the House on the subject of taxation of food; and as to a general tariff, in July last year my noble friend said—

> "In no speech or statement made by the Prime Minister or a member of the Government will be found any proposal pointing in the direction of such a penal tariff as is described in Mr. Chamberlain's speech. I believe I may go further. I believe that in one of the Prime Minister's speeches he expressed doubts of the wisdom of any proposals of the kind. If we were at closer quarters with the question I would certainly be inclined to ask what is meant by a moderate tariff. What do you mean when you say it is mainly for revenue purposes?"

Continuing my noble friend said—

> "I confess I see no object in pursuing the subject at this moment; no proposals of the kind are ripe for discussion, and no such proposals are likely to be before us for a long time to come."

Now, my Lords, I maintain that the correspondence published some time last week between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain marks a very great advance upon the categorical declarations I have referred to. I think we ought to know a good deal more about this correspondence. We were told, apparently on very good authority, a very short time before its appearance, that, as the result of consultation between the two parties to the correspondence, absolute agreement between them had not been arrived at; and I think we have a right to know what circumstances have enabled them at so short an interval to come to this apparent agreement.

On the first appearance of the correspondence it appeared to me to indicate something in the nature of a compromise. I thought I observed in it some indication that, although Mr. Chamberlain may not have changed any of his opinions, still, he nevertheless intended to moderate in some degree the distinctly protectionist characteristics of the policy he had been urging on the country. But I am told there is no compromise, that Mr. Chamberlain has abandoned none of the proposals he has hitherto advocated; and I can only say that, if there is no compromise, if Mr. Chamberlain has abandoned none of his proposals, and if there is also absolute agreement with the late Prime Minister, if it is not a compromise, if it is a definition of policy, as we have been told it is, upon which Unionist leaders are in agreement, then I can only say it is a definition of a policy which we long suspected was entertained by members of His Majesty's late Government which was not, up to the publication of the correspondence, avowed, but is now avowed, and it is a policy that some of us, at all events, are not prepared to accept.

I have nothing to do—I am not concerned—with the qualifications that are introduced into the declaration of policy contained in Mr. Balfour's letter. I am not concerned with the adjectives which qualify the main propositions laid down by Mr. Balfour. I am not concerned with the adjectives of a moderate tariff on manufactured goods or a small tax on corn. I am not concerned with the "whiles" or "ifs" which are contained in this declaration of policy. I take the definite and concrete propositions which it contains, and I find the late Prime Minister is committed by this correspondence to the definite statement that a general tariff on manufactured goods and a small duty on foreign corn are not in principle objectionable and should be adopted. Mr. Balfour has told us, no doubt in courteous language, but he has told us, what he thinks of any one who identifies his policy with the method and policy of protection. I am not going, therefore, to attempt to contend that his policy is a policy of protection. All I know is that those methods and principles to which he has now given his consent are the methods which have been from the beginning advocated by Mr. Chamberlain as the means by which the policy of the Tariff Reform League may be carried out. And those methods and principles I decline to agree to as a declaration of Unionist policy.

I think the publication of this correspondence is a step far in advance of anything which we have hitherto heard from the leaders of the Unionist Party, and as such it is deserving of the notice of Parliament. I do not desire to exaggerate its importance. We have for a long time believed that this was the policy advocated by the Leaders of the Party, if not by all their colleagues or by all their followers. I, on behalf of, and in co-operation with, a small number of Members of both Houses of Parliament, have taken every means in my power to announce our intention of opposing to the best of our ability the policy advocated by the Tariff Reform League; and all that has happened in consequence of the publication of these letters is that we are obliged now to state as plainly as we can that we are opposed to the constructive policy which is now announced by the Leader of the Unionist Party.

It will be a very long time before these declarations can have any practical effect whatever. It will be a long time before the Unionist Party and its Leaders will be in a position to advocate any constructive policy. Much may happen in the interval, and it is possible that means may be found by which a not inconsiderable portion of the Unionist Party may be able either to retain the liberty which they individually possess, or to regain that liberty on this subject. As regards the immediate future, I do not feel that any insurmountable difficulty has now been raised. I hold that the Government, supported as it is by the great and overwhelming majority of this country, has a right to a fair trial, including fair treatment in this House. I feel sure that my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition in this House holds the same opinion.

There is, therefore, so far as I can see, not the slightest probability that on many occasions those who hold my opinions will find themselves in a different lobby from my noble friend. At the same time I, as a Unionist, do not commit myself to any expression of general confidence in His Majesty's present advisers. I remain a Unionist, and I claim the right to remain a Unionist, irrespective of any opinions which I may hold on questions which are not connected with the Union. The Unionist Party to which I owe any allegiance is a free-trade Unionist Party, if such a Party may, by any possibility, be reconstituted in the future. As regards the constructive policy which by this correspondence has now been adopted in the name of the Unionist Party by the Leaders of the Unionist Party, I decline altogether to admit any allegiance to the Leaders or any responsibility for their action in regard to this policy, and I absolutely decline—I desire that it should be known that some of us, at all events, decline—to accept, as regards the future constructive policy of the Party, the leadership of those who have accepted the principles which I find embodied in the letters to which I have referred. My Lords, I beg to ask the Questions standing in my name on the Paper.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, I trust the House will extend to me that kindness and consideration which it has ever been the custom of your Lordships to extend to those who have the honour of addressing your Lordships for the first time. In answer to the Questions of the noble Duke, I have to say that the bulk of the information for which he asks is contained in the Board of Trade Returns for last December; but I can promise him that, so far as the information asked for goes further than the Returns of the Board of Trade already published, it will be supplied as far as possible at an early date.

I am in a position to amplify some of the figures quoted by the noble Duke, and to give further indications of the nation's prosperity. In 1903 our imports were £543,000,000; in 1904 they had increased to £551,000,000; and in 1905 to £565,000,000. The figures regarding the exports are most striking. The exports of British products in 1904 were £300,711,000; in 1905 they stood at £330,023,000. If these figures are worked out into six monthly periods, and compared with the corresponding six months of the previous year, we find that the increased exports of British produce, compared with the corresponding period in the previous year, from January to June, 1904, was £1,600,000; from July to December, 1904, £8,300,000; from January to June, 1905, £11,600,000; and from July to December, 1905, £17,700,000; and in the single month January, 1906, we find that the increase in that month over January, 1905, reached the enormous total of £5,800,000.

In the goods traffic of the twenty largest railways there was in 1905 an increase of 1·32 over 1904. This is always a very good test as to the trade of the country. The banking clearances in London showed an increase of 17 per cent. in 1905. With regard to the unemployed I am glad to say that there has been a gradual decrease in their numbers. The fall only amounted to ·03 per cent. in the first quarter of 1905 compared with the first quarter of 1904, but there was a further decline each quarter till they reached the satisfactory figure of 2·2 per cent. during the last quarter of last year. The actual percentage of 1905 was 6·8 in January and 4·9 in December. A census of wages is now being taken by the Board of Trade which will throw further light on the condition of the people. The figures I have been able to give the House in reply to the noble Duke appear to me to justify the references made to the imports and exports in His Majesty's most gracious Speech; and I imagine they point to a conclusion which will be much more likely to be of interest to the noble Duke as a convinced free trader than to those Members of your Lordships' House who desire a change in our fiscal conditions.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am grateful to the noble Duke for having postponed his speech until this evening, for it gives me an opportunity of offering to your Lordships a few observations, which I presume I should have been precluded from making had he followed me the other evening.

The noble Duke's speech fell naturally into two portions. He dealt, in the first place, with the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne relating to the prosperity of our trade. He then went on to discuss the attitude taken up by the leaders of the Unionist Party, and more particularly the correspondence which has lately passed between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain. With your Lordships' permission, I will say one or two words on each of these subjects. I am certainly not here to take any exception to the statement made in the gracious Speech from the Throne to the effect that our trade is at this moment in a prosperous condition; and all I can say is, if the statistics for which the noble Duke has asked and the information which is promised to us should show that the condition of our trade is even more prosperous than it has been described as being, no one will rejoice more keenly than I shall.

But, my Lords, I cannot admit that when the noble Duke has proved that there is an upward movement of trade he has proved that our present fiscal system is an absolutely perfect and satisfactory one. Is it quite clear that because our trade has been an improving trade during the last year or two we are justified in saying that all is well, and that we can with safety bask in the sunshine of a prosperity which may be with us one year and may be gone another? I doubt it extremely. I go further. I say that the noble Duke is precluded from taking up a position of that kind. The noble Duke is a free-trader of free-traders, and he has again and again admitted in this House and elsewhere that we enjoy in this country a condition of things which cannot be described as one of free trade, that the area within which free trade prevails is an area which shows an ever-increasing tendency to shrink. The noble Duke has made excursions into *Hansard* and has quoted speeches of mine. Will he forgive me if I make a brief reference to a speech of his? I desire to recall your Lordships' attention to a debate in this House in 1903 when we were discussing the question of an inquiry into our fiscal system. The noble Duke then said, in the first place—

> "There is no free-trader who can feel, or profess to feel, satisfied with the present position of the question. What the free-trader advocates is free interchange of commodities between all nations. What we have got is something very different from that. What we have got is free imports on one side and exports burdened by every barrier fiscal ingenuity can devise. The name of free-traders cannot with strict accuracy be applied to the supporters of our present fiscal system. We are not free-traders, because we have not got free trade."

Then the noble Duke dwelt on the fact that no progress had been made in any part of the world in the direction of real free trade, and he said—

> "What has happened has been that foreign countries have not lowered or relaxed the barriers they have set up against our imports. . . . So far from lowering or relaxing the tariffs they have raised against our trade, they have, generally speaking, I will not say in every case, strengthened and raised them."

The noble Duke went on to refer in a striking passage to the operation of the great trusts which are being built up on the Continent, and spoke of them as having been—

> "Capable of disorganising and dislocating the course of trade and industry as effectually as, if not more effectually than, the most retrograde and hostile tariff that ever could be raised against us"—

—and he summed up in this eloquent sentence—

> "These things cannot be set aside as if they were not."

But that is, I admit, a somewhat *ad hominem* argument. Let me suggest one or two other matters which the noble Duke appears to have left out of sight. In the gracious Speech from the Throne, along with references to the satisfactory growth of our trade, I find further on a paragraph dealing with the question of the unemployed. Are we prepared to say that all is well when so large a number of people in this country are out of employment? The noble Duke criticised severely a statement recently made by Mr. Chamberlain to the effect, I think, that 13,000,000 of our people were insufficiently fed and on the verge of poverty, and he took exception to the correctness of that statement. But surely we must all of us remember the statement made not very long ago by the present Prme Minister, to the effect that 12,000,000 of the people of this country were on the verge of hunger? There does not appear to me a very great difference in the estimates made in that matter by Mr. Chamberlain and the present Prime Minister. But by all means let us get to the bottom of these statements, and I have no doubt the Government will co-operate with the noble Duke in endeavouring to lay the fullest and most recent information before the House.

I should like to know, for example, whether it is or is not the case that our exports per head of the population have shown a considerable diminution during the last few years. I should like to know whether there is not in particular a marked falling off in our exports of manufactured articles; and I should like to know whether it is not the case that, owing to the restrictions put on our trade, we are losing some foreign markets altogether, and even losing ground in our own markets, and whether, in consequence of those restrictions, some manufacturers in this country have not been obliged to set up establishments outside the limits of the United Kingdom in foreign countries in order to get the benefit of the state of things that prevails there. I would also ask whether it is not the case, as has been said more than once in this House, that we are finding out more and more that most-favoured-nation treatment no longer affords us the security we at one time looked to obtain from that treatment; and I would further ask whether it is not the case that all these untoward symptoms are increasing as the years pass, and that we are less able to resist competition owing to the increasing wealth of the nations which compete with us, and owing to their continually improving organisation. All these matters require to be probed, and I trust they will be.

Now, my Lords, one word with regard to our position as we find it after the general election. To my mind the verdict of the election on this particular question was a conclusive verdict. We may hold, and some of us certainly do, that the verdict was the result of the misdirection of the jury, and that our proposals were grievously misrepresented; but, so far as this Parliament is concerned, the case has been judged and we cannot ask for a rehearing. But we cannot admit that this great question which we have raised, and which has interested the people of this country as few other questions have interested them, can be permanently set aside; and I, for one, venture to express my belief that no Government will permanently retain the confidence of the people of this country unless it is able to show that it is prepared to make some effort to obtain better treatment for the commerce of our people, and unless it is prepared to use all the resources of its diplomacy to obtain such treatment, and, if necessary, to strike back if such treatment is refused. And I must add that I believe that no Government will permanently retain the confidence of the country unless it shows that it is, at all events, ready to give a respectful hearing to our great Colonies and to consider with them whether anything can be done to draw the Colonies and the Empire closer together. I believe that in these doctrines there is no repudiation whatever of free trade. I believe that such doctrines may be held by convinced free-traders, by men who are as alive as any can be to the importance of cheap raw materials and cheap food supplies, and who have no desire whatever to bolster up tottering industries or to place burdens on the consumer in the interests of the producer in this country.

I now come to the correspondence to which the noble Duke has called attention. In the first place, I think we should ask ourselves whether that correspondence was called for or not. I venture to say that, upon the whole, I believe it was called for and that there is nothing *prima facie* unreasonable in these two public men, at the outset of our career in Opposition, endeavouring to find some common formula which could be accepted by the majority of the Party to which they belong; and this step seems to me the more defensible because of the unceasing and strenuous efforts which were made to prove to the public that there was an irreconcilable divergence of opinion between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain. What could be more natural than that they should endeavour to summarise in a few sentences their political creed so far as it represents the tenets they both of them are able to accept?

The noble Duke spoke of that letter as a considerable step in advance on Mr. Balfour's part. I am not going to trouble the House with quotations from speeches, but I can assure the noble Duke that if he will devote to Mr. Balfour's speeches some of the industry he exhibits in researches into my former utterances, he will find that there is nothing in Mr. Balfour's letter which is not to be found in the speeches which he has lately delievered in and out of Parliament.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: "Should be adopted."

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Yes, "should be adopted if required."

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Ah! if.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Duke has a playful way of brushing aside all qualifications. When he read the letter he ridiculed the idea of attaching any importance to the qualifications, and he omitted them from his quotation. But in a document of that importance I submit that the qualifications not only should not be ignored and omitted, but that such qualifications are of extreme importance, and may have to be referred to hereafter in very critical circumstances.

The noble Duke has examined Mr. Balfour's letter. Let me, if I may be permitted, review its contents limb by limb. The letter affirms in the first place that fiscal reform remains our first constructive work. I entirely agree with what the noble Duke told your Lordships to the effect that for some time to come we are not very likely to have opportunities of applying ourselves to constructive work. I think it was Mr. Balfour himself who some time ago told his audience that our work was more likely to be that of criticism than that of construction. I think so also; but I would ask the noble Duke what he expected us to do. Did he expect us to recant everything we had said as to the importance of this question? Would he, if he had been in our position, have thrown overboard light-heartedly an opinion he had deliberately formed and which he had constantly advocated for two or three years? I do not believe it for a moment. I would remind the noble Duke again of the words I quoted just now—

> "These things cannot be set aside as if they were not."

That is the noble Duke's motto. That is our motto also.

The letter goes on to affirm the need of obtaining more equal terms of competition for our commerce. Are we to understand that the noble Duke is indifferent to that object?

I think it fell to my lot last summer to remind the noble Duke that he had been for some time president of the British Empire League, a league formed with the object of promoting closer relations with the Colonies, and considering how it might be possible to modify any law or treaty which impeded freedom of action in Imperial trade. I appeal to the noble Duke up to that point as one whose opinions do not differ from ours. I think it is only when we come to the further portions of the letter that the noble Duke and I are likely to part company. The noble Duke takes exception to the letter because it mentions a moderate general tariff and a small duty on corn as possible means amongst others for obtaining the desired end. If the noble Duke will read the letter with the attention it deserves he will find that both of these methods are mentioned only as methods which we do not desire to exclude from discussion. And how would it have been possible for us to have advocated a conference with the great Colonies and to have said that at such a conference we could not admit even the discussion of a small duty on food stuffs?

The noble Duke then went on to quote extracts from speeches which I delivered to your Lordships in this House. He has with great courtesy given me the extracts which he used, and I have looked at them as carefully as time permitted. I find in those extracts nothing to retract, nothing inconsistent with the attitude which we adopted then, or with that we adopt now. Let me remind your Lordships of the situation when those speeches were delivered. We had put forward as our immediate policy the policy known as that of retaliation and free conference with the Colonies; that I described, and I think I described it correctly, as a self-contained policy. When, however, we came to the further question of a tariff and of the taxation of food, it is quite true that I said that we were opposed to, and should oppose, either of those proposals if they were put forward at that time. Why? Because these were the proposals which were expressly reserved for further examination and discussion at the Colonial Conference. We had, indeed, even gone the length of saying that without, not only one general election, but two general elections, we would undertake that those proposals should not be put before the country. Therefore I say that far from desiring to take back what I then said, what I then said appears to me to have been entirely reasonable and correct so far as the then situation was concerned.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: The Colonial Conference had never been mentioned when the first speech was made.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: It certainly was when the second speech was made. But, at any rate, the pledge was, that there should be two general elections before we were at liberty to put these specific proposals before the country. If I may use my own expression again, I said it was necessary that we should be at closer quarters with this question. My Lords, we were not at close quarters at that moment with either of those propositions. If the noble Duke desires to know my own opinion in regard to the taxation of food and the question of a general tariff, I am absolutely convinced that the 2s. duty proposed by Mr. Chamberlain would not add appreciably to the cost of living, but I admit that the people of this country have not been induced to look at it in that light. I will tell noble Lords opposite why. Because they and their friends have been inundating the country with literature and speeches grossly misrepresenting the effects of a 2s. duty. They must know perfectly well that the electors throughout the United Kingdom have been told that the effect of a 2s. duty would be to put them back into the state of things which prevailed in the hungry forties, when wages were low and food dear. A great many of the electors were induced to believe those reckless statements, and until the impression left by them has been removed, the suspicion with which this proposal has been regarded will no doubt remain.

With regard to a general tariff, I should personally be reluctant to see such a tariff resorted to if any other means of attaining the desired object could be discovered. But here, again, I must remind the noble Duke of one of those reservations contained in the letter which he found it convenient to ignore. It is expressly laid down that if we are ever to resort to such a tariff, it is to be one imposed not with the object of raising prices or with that of artificially protecting our industry from legitimate competition. That is a limitation which I should have thought, far from being derided, might have been welcomed with enthusiasm by a free-trader like the noble Duke; for it does in effect preclude those who may be regarded as having subscribed to the formula from recommending the imposition of any tariff which can really and truly be described as a protective tariff. In regard to both the tariff and to the proposed tax upon corn, I feel that the propriety of adopting either of those measures depends entirely upon what you would obtain in return for them; and that is the reason why we so earnestly desired to get to close-quarters with the Colonies and to find out what kind of arrangement they were willing to make with us. The Conference has, however, been put off till 1907, and we have been told on high official authority that when it does meet it is to be precluded from discussing these questions. Therefore it may be long before we have an opportunity of knowing what the mind of the Colonies really is, and until we do know whether we are likely to obtain a reasonable equivalent for those two concessions it seems to me that there is not very much use in debating their propriety.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I thought there was an offer.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Yes, there was an offer, which I imagine would have had to be examined and ratified by the Conference; I do not think the offer was of a kind which could have been clinched at once by the signature of a Minister. If I may sum up what I have to say with regard to the correspondence, I feel that in having voted confidence in Mr. Balfour with that correspondence before me, I retain a full measure of liberty with regard to the adoption of both the proposals which we are discussing. They may, in my opinion, be subscribed to by all Unionists who believe that our present fiscal system is imperfect, and who desire that an attempt should be made to improve that system; but I do not regard myself as bound to recommend their immediate adoption, and still less do I consider that we are in any way bound to ex-communicate from our Party those who either desire to go further than we do or who desire to go less far with regard to these important matters.

We have listened with great interest to the noble Duke's statement, and I am certainly not going to express regret that it should have been made. But I do trust that now that it has been made, and now that the air has been cleared by these discussions, we Unionists shall find something better to do than to take up our time in mutual recriminations. Surely the moment is one when we may realise that the fiscal question does not occupy the whole area of our political life, and that the Unionist Party has work before it other than that of again and again discussing this much debated problem.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My Lords, I wish indeed we could reach the point to which my noble friend has referred, and that the Unionist Party might now act unitedly, and devote themselves entirely to those great problems that are sure to be brought before Parliament. May it be so. But we have had a warning, given by Mr. Chamberlain, that this fiscal question is not to be dropped, that it is to be set before every constituency, and that the process of education is to go on. If this propaganda is to go forward under the united auspices of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour it will be difficult for those within the Party who differ from them to abstain from placing before the country their views, and thus continuing the controversy which I had myself hoped, after the decisive verdict of the country, might, for a time at least, have been allowed to cease. What is the position of those inside the Party who may hold free-trade views? If they offer themselves to the constituencies may we hope that there will be no recriminations, that they may have free access to the organisation of the Party and share the privileges of the Party? If that is granted, then indeed we shall be in the position I should like to see, when we might all act together. I trust that my noble friend who last spoke will use his great and just influence with his colleagues in the late Government to secure such a treatment of the whole question as will enable us to act together. I have taken a considerable share in the controversy as to the differences of opinion between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain. I have maintained continually, against the opinion of most of my friends, that Mr. Balfour was not moving, if I may use an expression which came from my noble friend behind me, towards the "Birmingham abyss." I have maintained that there was a distinct and wide difference between the two—namely, that while Mr. Balfour was anxious only to retaliate in those cases where retaliation was specially necessary, Mr. Chamberlain wished to cover the whole country with a tariff which would rest upon trade as a whole instead of simply aiding parts that might be shown to be especially suffering. I think my noble friend behind me has now abandoned the policy of retaliation. The word was not mentioned—let it go. The policy of retaliation has gone, and the subtitute for it is a moderate tariff, which is, in effect, the scaffolding for protection. It covers the whole ground, and it lends itself to every form of protection. Let me point out this further consideration, that the late Prime Minister has never said one word in support of the Tariff Reform Commission or the Tariff Reform League. The gentlemen of the Tariff Reform Commission have been doing, I dare say, a great deal of good work, but I have always thought it a weakness of that Commission that those who were not tariff reformers were not placed upon it in order to cross-examine the witnesses and to bring out the other side. But Mr. Balfour has never taken the line of approving, so far as I have studied his utterances, the work of the Tariff Reform Commission, and I would ask this question—Has Mr. Chamberlain given up his 10 per cent. tariff all round? That is not a moderate tariff on a great many things; has Mr. Chamberlain yielded it? Mr. Chamberlain has always claimed Mr. Balfour from the beginning. Mr. Balfour has never claimed Mr. Chamberlain, and the fact of Mr. Chamberlain's having claimed Mr. Balfour, while Mr. Balfour sat by continually in silence led most people to believe that he was with Mr. Chamberlain. With my great regard, and I may say my personal affection, for Mr. Balfour, I regretted to see him in the position that he was continually claimed by a section of the Party to which, I believe, he really did not adhere.

But now it is past, the union between the two has come. It is not a compromise, we are told. A compromise would mean that Mr. Chamberlain had surrendered something and that Mr. Balfour had surrendered something. I think I see what Mr. Balfour has surrendered. He has surrendered retaliation and accepted a moderate tariff.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I did not interrupt the noble Viscount when he made the same statement a few minutes ago, but I am perfectly able to state positively that Mr. Balfour has not abandoned the policy which, for the sake of convenience, though, I think, rather inappropriately, we speak of as the policy of retaliation.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: I would like to ask whether Mr. Chamberlain has accepted retaliation, and whether it will remain part of the constructive policy of the Conservative Party. Apparently we are not yet at the end of the difficulties of understanding precisely where we stand. I am perfectly prepared to accept for myself that this letter now represents the constructive policy of the Unionist Party. I dissent from it, like the noble Duke, but I understand it. I understand now that retaliation, the great cardinal point of Mr. Balfour's policy, though never mentioned in the letter, is not abandoned; but I do not think, and perhaps we have no right to expect, that my noble friend can answer the further question whether the 10 per cent. all-round tariff is abandoned by Mr. Chamberlain. That is not in the letter, but is that part of the constructive policy of the Unionist Party? Is that one of the points which are going to be urged in the constituencies? If in a constituency a Tariff Reformer goes down and, claiming that he represents Mr. Chamberlain, is in favour of a 10 per cent. all-round tariff, will the Free Trade Unionist be able to reply, "That is not in the letter, and is therefore not part of the constructive policy?"

There is enough in the letter to make Free Trade Unionists feel that they cannot support that policy, and I associate myself with the words which the noble Duke used in regard to it.

I desire to say one word with reference to the other part of the controversy that has been raised this evening—namely, the question of the state of prosperity. My noble friend behind me asked a good many questions as to which I would say that, if he would really like the information he has asked for, these inquiries should have been made before the Conservative Party had been absolutely committed to the views which are in the letter. Surely all these questions as to the state of trade are at the bottom of the causes which have led to this controversy, and they must be in the minds of the leaders of the Party. I am surprised to hear my noble friend ask whether exports have been increasing in proportion to the population. Exports have increased more than 1 per cent.; the population increases at the rate of 1 per cent. per annum. Again my noble friend will find that there is a decided increase in the exports of manufactured goods, and that lately, too, there has been an increase in the exports of manufactured goods to Germany and other countries, where before our trade had considerably fallen off. I think my noble friend will find that that is so, but I can only rejoice that further light is to be thrown on the subject.

As to the constant use that has been made by public men on both sides of the still practically unofficial statement that one-third of the population are under-fed, I would remind your Lordships that that statement was originally made by Mr. Charles Booth and Mr. Rowntree. They examined the causes and produced interesting, but very speculative, statistics with reference to this matter; but I do not think that any Government Department or any other body of statisticians have really checked that figure, nor do I believe that one-tenth of the people who quote it know what was the mean standard which was adopted by Mr. Rowntree in his calculations, and upon which a great deal, of course, depends. The 13,000,000 was first used, in any prominent case, by the present Prime Minister, and he used it, if I remember rightly, to show want of employment and poverty which had been produced by a long series of Conservative extravagances, wars, and other causes of that kind. I knew, the moment I read it, that it would be immediately taken up by the tariff reformers, and that the poverty of these 13,000,000 would be utilised on the other side as a statistical and political argument in order to prove that our commercial system was at fault. It appears to me that this matter ought to be cleared up, and that we ought to have a classification of these 13,000,000. Above all, we ought to see, what has never yet been shown, how increasing the cost of living, the cost of materials—building plant and so forth—how protection of that kind would improve the position of these people.

As we all know, the building trade is in a suffering and depressed state; but how that depressed trade is to be improved by the taxation of window-frames, cement, and a number of materials that enter into the building trade passes my understanding. So, again, there is considerable depression in the shipping trade, in the docks. I think we all admit that a diminution of imports would decrease our shipping; and how an interference with free imports would improve the position of the docks and of the vast community that depend upon them is, again, a matter which I do not understand. I appeal to His Majesty's Government to have this question of the 13,000,000 thoroughly examined, and also to examine the question of the unemployed, classifying those who can be employed and those who would never be employed whatever might be our fiscal policy. Then we would be able to test whether, by any changes in tariff, we could improve the lot of this vast multitude, which is not a new multitude. It is not fair to use the question of the unemployed as one of the main reasons why we should reverse the system of free trade, and tamper with our import trade, upon which a large portion of our export trade depends. I would reiterate my hope that future controversy on this matter may be so carried on within the Unionist Party that it may leave no bad feeling behind it, and that whether they agree with the tariff reformers or with more moderate men, all will have an equal chance within the Party and in the constituencies.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, in the absence of my noble friend the Leader of the House, who, I regret to say is unable to be here to-night, it falls to my lot to say a few words upon this debate. We all, I think, have reason to be grateful to the noble Duke for having introduced this subject, which has divided itself into two perfectly distinct parts, for by the happy custom of your Lordship's House he was able to hang upon his Question a great deal more than met the eye in the Question itself as it stood on the Paper. As regards the subject matter of the Question, my noble friend who represents the Board of Trade, and who, I am sure, your Lordships will agree, acquitted himself remarkably well on his first appearance as a speaker in this House, was able to produce certain figures supplied by the Board of Trade. The noble Marquess who leads the Opposition has asked for more information, but, like the noble Viscount who spoke last, I am not quite certain whether all the Questions which he put were, in his opinion, Questions that could be answered by mere statistics. Two or three of his Questions undoubtedly could, and upon those we shall be happy to give all the information in our power; but some of his later Questions took a somewhat rhetorical form, and I imagine he did not suppose we would be able to supply figures which would answer them.

As regards the speech of the noble Viscount who has just sat down, I can assure him that His Majesty's Government will be anxious to do all they can to supply him with the figures for which he asks He gave what I believe to be a perfectly correct account of the now famous phrase as to 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 people supposed to be on the verge of hunger. That quotation first came into fame through its use by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. He stated it as a quotation, and not from any personal knowledge of his own. As the noble Viscount Lord Goschen has pointed out, it is a computation arrived at by gentlemen of great experience, but it carries no official authority. I am disposed to believe it was arrived at by taking the statistics of a particular town, taking certain household budgets in that town, regarding some of them as adequate and others as inadequate, and then, by multiplying the number of such people into the population a figure of something like 12,000,000 was arrived at who were reported as being inadequately fed. But the statistics, as I say, were not of an official character, although no doubt they are worthy of very serious consideration. I can tell the noble Viscount that at this moment the Labour Department of the Board of Trade are engaged in making a census of wages, which it is believed will throw a great deal of light on this particular question. I can assure him that everything that fell from him will receive the close attention of that Department, and if it is possible still further to enlarge the area of inquiry, that will be done.

As regards the question of the general prosperity of the country, I have no desire to repeat what has fallen from my noble friend Lord Granard; but I may just quote one sentence, on the authority of Mr. Chamberlain, as to what can be taken as a rough test of the prosperity of the country. Speaking at Newcastle in 1903, Mr. Chamberlain said—

> "I will not say entirely, but it is mainly to our exports that we must look for a test of the progress of our trade."

If that test is taken I think, resting upon the figures produced this evening by my noble friend who represents the Board of Trade, it cannot be said that our trade is in an unsatisfactory condition at this moment. "That may be so," says the noble Marquess opposite, "but can it be said that all is well?" Well, I am not aware that anybody attempted to say that all is well, either with our trade or with the conditions of employment in this country. Things are perhaps never so well that they might not be better; but the question is whether the particular remedies which are suggested in order to improve our condition are sound remedies in themselves, and whether they are likely to have the effect which is prophesied for them by those who desire to see them introduced.

Now, my Lords, on the other question, I do not feel that on this side of the House we have any great title to discuss differences of opinion which may have arisen between members of the opposite Party, except so far as this—that it is not merely a matter of interest to those who belong to the Unionist Party, but it is a matter of interest to the whole country whether the declared policy of that Party is in the future to be a protectionist policy or not. That is not a matter which we can lightly regard, and therefore I am obliged to say a few words on the subject from that point of view. I think the noble Marquess opposite would not admit that he had in any way changed his opinion since this subject has been under discussion, but I am bound to say that, as the noble Viscount remarked, it does seem to me a distinct change of position from having advocated retaliation as he did in this House with great force—retaliation pure and simple—to, I will not say advocating, but generally admitting, the possibility of a general tariff on manufactured goods. I have always thought that the noble Marquess was what may be called a diplomatic retaliationist; that, presiding over the Foreign Office, he was fascinated by the idea of being able in that department to deal with foreign Powers, and to deal with them as he considered on better terms than he now could. I think it is not at all impossible that on some occasions, with the use of the noble Marquess's revolver, foreign Powers might be induced to lower their tariffs. I will not dwell on that subject at present; but it has always seemed to me that the noble Marquess rather confined his point of view to the notion of a diplomatic victory at the moment, and did not allow himself to consider what the consequence in the country would be if on some occasion the foreign country was not terrified by his threat, and a duty—possibly a very large one—had to be imposed.

The question of interest to us on this side is—Is protection to be the declared official policy of the Unionist Party? I know, my Lords, that almost everybody who has taken part on the opposite side on behalf of fiscal reform has repudiated the name of protectionist on the ground that they did not desire to see a return to the state of things which existed in England before 1842, when Sir Robert Peel began, as we all know, to lower the scale of high duties. I do not know that anyone is entitled to say that nobody can be called a protectionist unless he desires to see a return to the state of things that existed then, any more than you could say that no man ought to be called a Home Ruler unless he wished to see a return to Grattan's Parliament. The term Protectionist is well understood. It is a term used for those who desire to see duties put on for other purposes than revenue; and if you look through Mr. Chamberlain's speeches—for it is to him that we have to look for clear statements on this matter—you will find that from first to last Mr. Chamberlain, while pointing out other advantages which he conceived would attach to his policy, scarcely ever failed to point out what may be called the purely protective side—namely, the advantage which would accrue to particular trades—and he referred almost invariably to the trade with which those whom he was addressing were mainly concerned — by the imposition of duties on manufactured goods. At

Greenock it was sugar, at Liverpool watches, and at Birmingham small brass articles and pearl buttons. If you turn to the publications of the Tariff Reform League, to which the noble Viscount alluded—I have not read them all, but I have studied some of the evidence given in those publications—you will see that over and over again the witnesses asked for what they called moderate protection. Nobody asked in so many words for immoderate protection, and I imagine that the noble Marquess and his friends would not dispute that to a certain extent it is Protection that forms a part of their policy. As to the Colonial Conference, the noble Marquess said he understood that in future the Conference would be precluded from discussing the question of the taxation of food, and he announced that that had been stated on behalf of His Majesty's Government. I know of no such announcement.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The statement I referred to was made by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. I do not know whether I quoted it with absolute correctness, but it was to that effect.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I imagine that any offer made by the Colonies, or any expression of a desire on their part to discuss any question whatever, would be carefully attended to. What undoubtedly is the case is that we are precluded from in any way proposing the taxation of food for two reasons. In the first place, we are unanimously opposed to it ourselves; and, in the second place, the result of the general election shows that the country is opposed to that policy. It is obvious, therefore, that no proposition of the kind could come from us. I have not the least doubt that any proposition which was made by the Colonies would be respectfully heard, and if the noble Marquess imagines that the closure would be moved, or anything of that kind, I can assure him that that is not the case.

The noble Marquess alluded to a 2s. tax on corn as being generally agreed to be harmless in the direction of raising prices. We all know, of course, that a 2s. tax on corn, although it would increase the price of bread to a certain extent, would not increase it to a very large degree; but, as I take it, one reason why we on this side and noble Lords below the gangway object to a 2s. tax on corn is that there is no guarantee that it will stop at 2s. or that Mr. Chamberlain in the course of a year or two may not desire to raise it to 5s. or even to 8s. or 9s. We all know that Germany began with a very low tax on corn, but in response to agitation, which is almost bound to follow the imposition of any tax at all, it has been gradually raised to its present high figure. I cannot better state the opinion of His Majesty's Government on this whole subject than by quoting some words which were used in Manchester in 1903, by the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount St. Aldwyn), whom we are so glad to see in this House. He stated then that—

> "It is a canon of British finance that no customs duty should be raised without an equivalent excise."

He went on to point out that when it is, the Exchequer receives less than half what the consumer pays; and then the noble Viscount proceeded to ask—

> "Can anybody suppose that the figures would remain small?"

and he concluded by saying—

> "There is nothing in Mr. Chamberlain's proposal to induce us to change the fiscal policy under which the condition of the country has enormously improved, and the wages of the working classes have increased much above those of the corresponding class in other European countries, with shorter terms of labour."

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 22nd February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PETITIONS.

ADMIRALTY (DISABLED SAILORS AND MARINES).

Petition from Canterbury, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING).

Petitions for legislation, from Hebdon Bridge, Falmouth, Mossley, and Nottingham; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Petition from London, for reduction; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CHELSEA HOSPITAL.

Account [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 49.]

SAVINGS BANKS (INVESTMENT) REGULATIONS.

Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 50.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Paper [presented 19th February] to be printed. [No. 51.]

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1904, Part II. (Statistics) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (INTERNATIONAL PENITENTIARY CONGRESS AT BUDA-PESTH, 1905).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Sir E. Ruggles-Brise, K.C.B., Chairman of the Prison Commission for England and Wales, and British Delegate, on the Proceedings of the Seventh International Penitentiary Congress held at Buda-Pesth in 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of General Order amending the Dispensary Rules [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order directing that the several Orders for the time being in force for regulating the proceedings of Boards of Guardians, and the keeping and auditing of accounts, etc., shall as far as the same are applicable thereto govern the proceedings of the Boards of Management of the District Schools at Trim and Glin [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS, ENGLAND (FEES)

Copy presented, of Treasury Order, dated 22nd February, 1906, amending the Order of 30th December, 1903, regulating Court Fees in County Courts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1905–6).

Estimate presented, of the further amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1906, for Temporary Commissions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 52.]

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Great Grimsby, and in the rural district of Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey), from Great Grimsby to Immingham (Grimsby District Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Newark and in the rural district of Newark, in the county of Nottingham (Newark and District Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the Borough of Bideford and from Landcross to Clovelly and Hartland, all in the county of Devon (Bideford, Clovelly, and Hartland Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Chester from Tarporley to a junction with the Railway of the Cheshire Lines Committee near Mouldsworth (Tarporley Light Railway Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Seaham Harbour and in the rural districts of Easington and of Sunderland, in the county of Durham (Ryhope, Seaham, Murton, and South Hetton Light Railways Order, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENTS).

Return ordered, "of the number of Assessments to the Income-Tax for the years ending the 5th day of April, 1904, and the 5th day of April, 1905 (in the same classes and in the same amounts as stated in and in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 179, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Report on the Crinan Canal.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will have a Report laid upon the Table as to the present condition of the Crinan Canal, the necessity for further expenditure in maintaining it, and the probable cost of a ship canal to take its place.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The hon. Member is no doubt aware that the Government have decided to appoint a Royal Commission upon the canals in the United Kingdom, and, subject to the consent of the Treasury, the points raised in the Question of the hon. Member shall be submitted to the Royal Commissioners for their consideration.

Unemployed Workmen Act—Suggested Treasury Grant.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that local and central distress committees formed under The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, find difficulty in providing useful work for those registered by such committees as out of work, owing to lack of funds, he will make a grant of money from the Treasury to meet this emergency pending proposed legislation upon this subject.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) I am afraid that no grant can be made pending the legislation promised in the King's Speech.

Entries on Soldiers Defaulter Sheets.

Sir W. EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the remarks made by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught upon the present system of making entries in the defaulters sheet of soldiers; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This matter has been already taken up and has been referred to General Officers Commanding-in-Chief for consideration and report.

Colonel Pollock's Scheme of Army Training.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the experiment suggested by Colonel Pollock of giving thorough training in six months to a company corresponding to Militia recruits, and to the fact that £3,000 has been privately subscribed for the purpose; and, having regard to the importance of training men to arms in the shortest possible time, the Army Council will complete the sum required by a grant of £500.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) My attention has been drawn to the scheme mentioned in the Question. The Army Council regard this scheme as purely a private experiment. It will not, therefore, be possible to make the direct contribution suggested out of Army funds. In view, however, of the fact that the experiment is regarded as very interesting from the military point of view, it has been decided to lend arms and accoutrements, a limited number of hutments and a drill ground at Hounslow, or camp equipment, if preferred.

Army Recruiting in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the returns of recruiting for the Army in Ireland during the year 1905 show any falling off in number compared with previous years; if so, to what extent; and whether the recruiting officers attribute the decrease to the movement fostered by the Gaelic League, and known as the Sinn Fein policy.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The returns for recruiting in Ireland during the year 1905 show a falling off in numbers as compared with previous years, but this decrease is general throughout the United Kingdom. I have no reason for believing that the Gaelic League is an organisation which aims at affecting recruiting in one way or the other, nor have I any evidence that this or any other body has had an appreciable effect on recruiting in Ireland.

South African Garrison.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the force of British troops now stationed in South Africa; what is the annual cost of that force, including a due allowance for the capital cost of barracks, etc.; and whether the whole cost of that force is borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The establishment of British troops in South Africa is about 20,000 of all ranks. The annual cost of the force, including allowance for the capital cost of barracks, etc., is about £2,400,000. Under present arrangements Natal makes a contribution of £4,000 a year.

Position of the Judge-Advocate.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say what are the terms and conditions upon which the present Judge-Advocate-General holds his appointment, and whether and how it can be determined; and whether the present holder of that office is subordinate to the Secretary of State without direct access to the Sovereign; and, if so, whether there is any precedent for an appointment on such terms.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The terms and conditions of the present appointment are as follows: (1) A salary of £2,000 a year; (2) The devotion of his whole time to the duties of the post; (3) The retention of the post until the age of seventy, subject to continued efficiency, but without claim to pension or gratuity on retirement. The present holder is subordinate to the Secretary of State, without direct access to the Sovereign, and in this respect the post of Judge-Advocate of the Fleet may be considered as a precedent.

Post Office Wages Committee.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the expediency of appointing early this Session a Committee of this House to inquire into and report upon the grievances of which the postal employees complain.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) As my hon. friend is probably now aware, I stated on Tuesday in reply to a similar Question from the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division of Northumberland that I propose to move for a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry.

Tenure and Trusts of Premises of Voluntary Schools.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the President of the Board of Education, whether he will grant a Return showing, as far as practicable, the tenure and trusts of the premises of voluntary schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I shall be happy to do my best to make the Return asked for.

Indian Civil Officials—Extension of Leave caused by Lateness of Steamers.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that officers under military rules travelling to India by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, the British India Steam Navigation Company, and the Anchor Line are exempted from the penalty attaching to overstaying their leave by reason of delay in the arrival of the steamer provided the steamer's time to arrive is within the period of their leave, he will explain why the same privilege is not extended to officers under the provisions of the Civil Service Regulations, or to the civilians in Goverment employ; and whether he will take steps to place both services on the same footing.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I am not aware that any inconvenience has resulted from the difference to which the hon. Member draws attention between the leave rules of the Civil and Military Services, nor can I find that any representations on the subject have been made by any Civil Officer to the India Office. But I will consult the Government of India as to the desirability of assimilating the Civil to the Military Regulations in respect of the remission of penalties for overstaying leave when the overstayal is due to delay in the arrival of a steamer.

Scarcity of Boats on the Royal Canal.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland have received complaints as to the insufficient number of boats on the Royal Canal; whether any inspection of the condition of the canal has been made for the past twelve years; whether he can state if the defect in the Spencer Dock Gate has yet been repaired; whether the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, have been applied to respecting those complaints; and, if so, whether he can explain why some attempt has not been made to have them remedied.

(*Answered by Mr. M'Kenna.*) 1. I learn from the Board of Works, Ireland, that they have no information as to the number of boats on the Royal Canal, and are not in a position to state whether any complaints have been received by the Midland Great Western Railway Company. 2. Several inspections of the Royal Canal have been made during the past twelve years. Complete examinations of the whole waterway took place in 1899, 1900, 1902, and 1905, and partial examinations in 1901, 1902, 1905, and 1906 (during the present month). 3. Considerable repairs have been done to the Spencer Dock gates during the past four and a half years. In 1901 complaints arose as to excessive leakage at these gates. The Board's engineer reported on this, and towards the end of 1901 works were carried out by the Midland Great Western Railway Company calculated greatly to lessen the leakage. The gates have received attention since 1901. 4. I have not been able to learn whether the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, have been applied to respecting the complaints referred to. 5. The attention of the Midland Great Western Railway Company has been called, when necessary, to such defects as were disclosed by the examinations of the Board's engineer, and efforts have been made, and continue to be made, to remedy such defects.

The Press and Court-Martial on Staff Sergeant Major Hilton.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) To ask the Secretary of State for War through what channel the proceedings at the first day's sitting of the district court martial, assembled for the trial of Staff Sergeant Major Hilton, Army Service Corps, was communicated to the Press, as on the first day on which the court assembled the Exchange Telegraph Company published a report of what had taken place, contrary to the provisions of the King's Regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. This court, like other courts martial, was open to the public, and therefore the Press was at liberty to publish a report of the proceedings.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Sailors as Railway Passengers.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the case of two petty officers of His Majesty's Navy, who, on 14th December attempted to return to Portsmouth by the South Western Railway, Waterloo Station, and were ejected from their carriage by order of the station master, who informed them that civilians object to the company of bluejackets; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): When the case was brought to my notice by the hon. and gallant Member, I made inquiries of the railway company, and I understand that, on the date in question, several hundred sailors were returning to Weymouth to join the Channel Fleet. The company had accordingly provided a special train for them, due to leave shortly after the ordinary morning express; and had the two petty officers concerned been permitted to enter the ordinary train, it would have been impossible to prevent the other sailors from following their example, with the result that the train would have become so overcrowded that its punctual despatch would have been impossible. It is not a fact that the station master informed these men that the civilians objected to the company of bluejackets. Sailors travel at reduced rates, and where the number travelling justifies the provision of special accommodation, the railway company claim the right of restricting the men to these trains.

Lord Cawdor's Memorandum.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether Lord Cawdor's memorandum of 30th November, 1905, is considered by the present Board of Admiralty to be binding in its decisions in regard to the future careers of the Osborne cadets and the future duties of the engine-room artificers; whether the Board has made an application for sanction by Order in Council of the changes affecting the officers and the engine-room artificers which were embodied in Lord Cawdor's memorandum; and, if so, will a copy of such Order in Council be laid upon the Table; whether any protests against Lord Cawdor's memorandum have been received from officers commanding our principal fleets, and also from other admirals in high positions who have commanded fleets; and, as the decisions in Lord Cawdor's memorandum were only made public during the recess, will the Admiralty defer action on it until the financial year 1906–7?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Lord Cawdor's memorandum of 30th November, 1905, contains a record of decisions arrived at by the Board of Admiralty under his and Lord Selborne's presidency which have come, or are coming, into operation. It is not proposed to defer further action with regard to them, but to watch closely their working and effect. An Order in Council affecting the stoker and mechanician ratings received the King's approval on 6th January, 1906. Representations disapproving of portions of the policy laid down in Lord Cawdor's memorandum have been received from certain officers of His Majesty's Navy; but, while the Board of Admiralty are always ready to consider representations made by officers serving under them, it must be clearly understood that the Board are alone responsible to Parliament for the government and discipline of His Majesty's Navy.

The "Assistance" Court Martial.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the officers censured in the Admiralty Memorandum on the "Assistance" court martial were in receipt of the memorandum before its publication in the Press; whether any Press writers were in receipt of the memorandum more than twenty-four hours before its publication; whether any report was made to the Admiralty by the Captain of the "Assistance" as to the ground tackle of that ship being ineffective; and whether he is aware that the "Assistance" dragged her anchors on several occasions owing to the ground tackle being too light.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No copies of the Admiralty Minute were issued to the Press until the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet had acknowledged the receipt of the letter forwarding it to him and directing him to communicate it to the Officers concerned. The Answer to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative. With regard to the last part of the question, no report was made by the Captain of the "Assistance" as to the ground tackle being ineffective, and nothing is known as to the ship having dragged her anchors at any time.

Admiralty Contracts.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the heads of departments in the Admiralty have been notified that the words "Goods to be of British manufacture and material" are not to appear in any specifications issued to contractors.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No, sir.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Do I understand that those British manufacturers who have hitherto enjoyed this measure of protection against foreign competition will continue to do so in the future?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No alterations have been made or are in contemplation. That is all I can say.

Northern Nigeria—Sale of Children—Salt Tax.

MR. BRUNNER (Lancashire, Leigh): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Northwich Division of Cheshire, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the Report for 1904 of Sir Frederick Lugard, High Commissioner for Northern Nigeria, in which the statement is made that the natives had been selling their children as slaves, and that the prices at which they were sold represented normally 1s. 9d. worth of corn and 10s. in salt; whether the duty on salt was increased a few years ago; and whether he can see his way to recommend its abolition or reduction.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): In reply to the hon. Member I have to say that the Secretary of State's attention has been called to the passage referred to in Sir F. Lugard's report. The children in question were sold owing to famine, and were liberated and taken charge of by the Government of Northern Nigeria. There is no indication in this passage that the price of salt is excessive; on the other hand, elsewhere in this same Report (p. 97) Sir F. Lugard writes, "The import duty on salt arriving in Northern Nigeria, which European traders at first protested against, has proved in no way injurious to their trade." The duty was increased in 1903 to the rate (40s. a ton) at which it was formerly levied by the Niger Company. The effects of the duty have been carefully considered and the Secretary of State cannot see his way to recommend its abolition or reduction.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal—Re-enlistment.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the changes contemplated in the Transvaal Labour Ordinance and the indentures attaching thereto, he will consider the advisability of cancelling the existing provision for the re-enlistment of any Chinese coolie at the close of his present term of engagement.

*MR. CHURCHILL: A clause in the Ordinance for the enlistment and importation of Chinese labourers permits the labourer to re-engage at the expiry of his original indenture for a further period or periods not exceeding in all three years. The earliest contracts will not expire before May, 1907, by which date the Transvaal will have become a self-governing colony. In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government, while reserving to themselves entire freedom of action upon the general question of the conditions under which Chinese labour is carried on, do not propose to cancel the provision of the Ordinance referred to.

Arrival of Chinese in South Africa.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when the next shipload of Chinese coolies is expected in South Africa. I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when the last shipload of Chinese coolies reached South Africa and where these men are now working.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The Transvaal Chamber of Mines reported on the 9th inst. that since January 31st the "Indravelli" had arrived with 1,943 coolies, and that 1,590 were on sea in the "Cranley," which appears to have arrived yesterday. I am not aware in which mines the men from the last ship-load are working.

Coolie Labour Regulations.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay upon the Table forthwith the revised regulations under which the recently arrived coolies are now living and working.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I am not yet in a position to lay upon the Table the exact terms of the modifications of the existing system referred to in the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury on Monday last.

Lord Milner and Corporal Punishment in South African Mines.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that corporal punishment of the Chinese labourers was last year widely resorted to by the mining authorities of the Witwatersrand district, and that it was administered in a manner borrowed from the practice of the Chinese courts of justice, he will say whether this was done with the knowledge and approval of Lord Milner; and, if so, whether Lord Milner has been called upon for any explanation of his conduct in sanctioning such punishments.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I have to refer the hon. Member to the telegram of 24th October printed at page 44 of Cd. 2796, in which Mr. Lyttelton stated that Mr. Evans informed Lord Milner of his action in not interfering if slight corporal punishment was administered on the mines in the circumstances described, and that Lord Milner took no objection. Lord Milner appears to have been communicated with, but no explanation by him is on record, though it is on record that Lord Milner agreed to the statement which appears in the Blue-book. The Secretary of State has, of course, had no opportunity of access to any explanations which Lord Milner may have made privately to his predecessor.

MR. MACKARNESS: Will the Secretary of State call upon Lord Milner for an explanation now?

*MR. CHURCHILL: I will consult the Secretary of State on that point.

Treatment of the Witwatersrand Coolies.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that, during last year, it was the practice of the Transvaal mining authorities of the Witwatersrand district illegally to punish Chinese labourers by head collars fastened round their necks, and by placing them in the stocks; and, if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I have to refer the hon. Member to the statement of Lord Selborne printed at page 22 of Cd. 2819 published on Tuesday last.

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is intended in the case of the repatriated Chinamen to compensate mineowners for the outlays incurred in the terms of the contracts already entered into and for any damage they may claim to sustain by the loss of such labour; and, if so, will the Government consider the advisability of charging such compensation, if admitted, against the £30,000,000 promised by the mine-owners of the Transvaal; and, if not, from what fund will the necessary expenses be drawn.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The right of Chinamen to be repatriated upon payment being tendered of the cost of their passages out and home is within a strict interpretation of Clause 14 of the Labour Ordinance. The payment of the cost of the passage from China is compensation for outlays, but no further claim for compensation on the part of mine-owners affected can arise.

MR. DALZIEL asked out of what funds the passages would be paid.

*MR. CHURCHILL: It has already been stated by the Prime Minister in the debate on the Address that the funds for enabling Chinamen who have not the necessary £17 10s. to return to their homes will be provided out of Imperial funds.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): What date will the supplementary estimate be introduced?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will it be as soon as the £30,000,000 are paid?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Transvaal War Contribution.

MR. DALZIEL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government have taken, or propose to take, any steps for the payment of the £30,000,000 promised by the South African mine-owners towards the expenses of the South African war.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I have to refer the hon. Member to my reply of yesterday to the hon. Member for the Bosworth Division of Leicester.

MR. DALZIEL: I can find in it no reference to the steps it is proposed to take.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I said the Government were considering their policy. I hope to be able to make an announcement shortly.

British Guiana Indian Labour Ordinance

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay upon the Table of the House the amendments proposed by his Department in the British Guiana Indian Labour Ordinance.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The Immigration Ordinance of British Guiana was recently amended by the Ordinance No. 24 of 1905, and no further amendment is at present in contemplation.

British Commercial Representation in Canada.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the strong desire expressed in Canada in favour of the appointment of official British commercial representatives in the Dominion; and whether, in conjunction with other Departments of State, he will take steps to comply with this desire.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is aware that this subject has attracted much attention in Canada. The Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence is at this moment considering the question of the despatch of a special commercial mission to Canada; and one object of such a commission would be to report upon the appointment of permanent commercial correspondents in the Dominion.

Elementary Education in Ceylon.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken to carry out in Ceylon the recommendations of the Elementary Education Commission, 1905, with respect to compulsory education in that colony; whether a conscience clause will be included in the new proposals; and if so, what will be its nature. I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of Ceylon proposes to include in the new Education Ordinance in that island a clause enabling the authorities to call upon planters to provide schools, or a school, for groups of estates, as recommended by the Elementary Education

Commission, 1905, and when legislation to this effect is likely to be introduced; and whether inspectors will be appointed to supervise existing and future schools.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: In reply to the hon. Member I have to inform him that the Governor's proposals with regard to elementary education in Ceylon have been under the consideration of the Secretary of State, and it is hoped that he will shortly be in a position to lay papers on the subject.

Education of Indian Coolie Children.

Mr. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will make representations to the Government of India with the view to the institution of adequate facilities for the education of the children of coolies employed in the agricultural districts of India, in tea gardens, cotton plantations, etc., in Assam, Madras, the Central Provinces, and Bengal.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. John Morley, Montrose Burghs): As was stated by my predecessor, in reply to Questions asked by my hon. friend last session, this question is already engaging the attention of the Government of India, and I do not consider it necessary at present to make any representation to that Government in regard to it.

China and the Thibetan Treaty.

Mr. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can give any information regarding the state of the negotiations between the British and Chinese Governments in the matter of the Thibetan Treaty.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): My right hon. friend will be in his place on Monday and will be prepared to answer any Questions addressed to him. On his behalf, in reply to this Question, I have to say that negotiations are at present proceeding with the Chinese Government in regard to the terms of a Convention for the adhesion of China to the Convention concluded with Tibet in 1904, but there is no intention of altering the terms of the latter Convention.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): Then do I understand that the arrangement announced by the Prime Minister to-day will be abandoned after Monday, and that the Secretary of State will in future answer his own Questions.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir. I only said that my right hon. friend would be in his place on Monday and answer Questions as far as he could.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Perhaps I may address myself to the Prime Minister? I quite understood him to say yesterday that when the Secretary of State was in his place it was his intention to answer Questions. Is that to be adhered to?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): My right hon. friend cannot alter the circumstances and the arrangements of business that make it difficult for him on many occasions to be present in his place at Question time. On the occasions when he is not able to be present, my hon. friend will answer his Questions; but what I understand is that my right hon. friend will be in his place on Monday and will then perhaps himself make a clearer statement than I have been able to make of the arrangements he finds possible in order to accommodate his duty towards the House with his duty to the office and to those whom he is obliged to see there.

Consular Reports and Commercial Information.

Mr. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps, if any, he proposes to take to render reports of British consuls of greater value to the mercantile community; whether he will instruct consuls to forward important commercial information whenever they may obtain it, without waiting for their annual reports; and whether he will, as is done in the United States, cause a daily issue of urgent commercial information received from consular officers.

MR. RUNCIMAN: With regard to the hon. Member's first Question, steps have already been taken within recent years with this object, and the new edition of the General Consular Instructions now in preparation contains revised and explicit directions on the subject. With regard to the second Question, regulations to this effect are already in force. With regard to the third Question the weekly *Board of Trade Journal* includes a large amount of commercial information, based on reports specially supplied by British consuls. Where even more immediate publication is desirable, in the interests of British trade, the Board of Trade make a practice of sending notices to the Press. The question of the best means of diffusing the commercial information is now under consideration of the Board of Trade Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence.

MR. NORMAN: When will the instructions be issued?

[No Answer was returned.]

Wei-Hai-Wei.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, if he can state what is the present *status* of Wei-Hai-Wei; and what are the intentions of His Majesty's Government concerning it.

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is not considered that the transfer of the Russian lease of Port Arthur to Japan has made any change in the present *status* of Wei-Hai-Wei, which is leased to His Majesty's Government, and no action is at present contemplated with regard to the lease.

Collection of Income Tax in Scotland.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that notices have been issued in Scotland for the recovery of income tax, with costs, if not paid within seven days, he will say whether similar notices have been issued in all towns in England, and if in future equality of treatment will be observed in England and Scotland in the recovery of income tax.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The procedure to compel payment of income tax in Scotland differs so materially from the corresponding procedure in England that exact equality of treatment between the two countries in the matter of recovery by distraint cannot be established, but everything possible has been and will be done to produce as close a correspondence as circumstances permit. In Scotland, collectors have no personal power of distraint, while, in England, the collector can himself distrain. Thus, the issue of a final notice in England means something much more drastic than the issue of the similar notice in Scotland; and, consequently, resort to it is commonly delayed to a slightly later date in England than in Scotland. Final notices are now due in England, but to what extent it has been or may be found necessary to use them it is impossible to say.

*MR. McCRAE: But is it not the case that the statute is the same for both countries?

MR. ASQUITH: I believe so.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): Is it not the fact that Scotch income taxpayers are subject to collection at a much earlier period than in England?

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think that is so.

Child Insurance.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the comments on the evils arising from child insurance which were made by the magistrate at the Clerkenwell Police Court in a recent case; and whether he contemplates taking any action in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have seen the comments of the magistrate upon the case to which the hon. Member refers. The criminal law on the subject could hardly be made more severe than it now is. A parent who insures her child and then is guilty of cruelty or culpable neglect is liable to penal servitude for five years under Section 1, Sub-section 4, of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904. The imposition of further restrictions on the insurance of children involves questions of much difficulty, and various proposals for legislation have not met with success; but I will bring the question to the notice of the Treasury, who are, I understand, considering other aspects of this matter.

Inspection of Laundries.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he proposes to introduce legislation dealing with the inspection of laundries carried on by religious institutions.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: The matter has and will have my attention, but I am not yet in a position to say whether legislation will be possible this session.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, according to the report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, no fewer than 14,000 woman and girls——

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Is it not the fact that the information in the Department shows the present system to be unsatisfactory?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: We have a great deal of information in the Department. I can only say that the matter will receive my attention as soon as possible.

Foreign Sailors in the Mercantile Marine—Case of the "Ordovician."

MR. J. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to the inquiry held at Cardiff into the loss of the Cardiff steamer "Ordovician"; whether he can state how many able seamen were employed and their respective nationalities; whether he can say how many of the alien seamen were able to speak and understand English; whether his attention has been directed to the remarks addressed to the court of inquiry by the learned stipendiary of Cardiff; and whether, seeing the dangers attached to the employment of alien seamen who cannot understand English, it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to introduce, at an early date, a Bill to prohibit the employment of such seamen, as recommended by the Mercantile Marine Committee.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Yes, Sir. My attention has been called to the case referred to in the question. I am informed that four able seamen were engaged at Swansea. One of these was a Greek and three were natives of a Greek island belonging to Turkey. I understand from the superintendent before whom the men were engaged that five of the alien seamen spoke and understood English fairly; and that three did not. My attention has been called to the remarks of the Cardiff stipendiary in the case. The matter generally is one with which it is proposed to deal in the Merchant Shipping Bill to be shortly introduced into Parliament.

MR. J. HAVELOCK WILSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the chief officer whose certificate was suspended for three months has held a master's certificate from the year 1887, that he has been presented by the Board of Trade with several medals for gallantry at sea, and will he under these circumstances, seeing that the loss of this ship was due to the want of proper seamen, consider the advisability of returning this officer his Board of Trade certificate, so as to allow him to earn his bread?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will promise to look into the matter.

Joint Stock Companies Acts.

SIR W. EVANS-GORDON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Committee appointed at the beginning of last year to inquire into the working of the Joint Stock Companies Acts has completed its deliberations; and whether he can say when the Report may be expected.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Committee, I understand, has concluded its sittings and the Report is being drafted, but I am not at present able to give a date when the Report may be expected.

Pollution of the Thames.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the estuary of the River Thames is being polluted by the discharge of crude sewage from the towns of Sheerness, Southend, and Whitstable; and whether he will communicate with the authorities of those towns urging upon them the importance, in the interest of public health, of adopting some system of sewage purification without further delay.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am aware of the discharge of crude sewage into tidal waters in the cases mentioned in the Question. As regards Whitstable the Local Government Board wrote to the district council on the subject last year, who contended that in the circumstances of their district they would not be justified in incurring the expenditure necessary for carrying out works for the treatment of the sewage. I will communicate with the town councils of Sheerness and Southend, but as respects Southend, it is fair to say that the alleged pollution has recently been the subject of judicial decision, and I understand that it is possible that the case may be carried to a higher court.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to take further steps until the matter has been finally adjudicated on in the Law Courts?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will give that question sympathetic consideration.

Payment of the Education Grant.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the confusion caused by the payment of the annual grant to the local education authorities at the end of each school year instead of by quarterly instalments; and whether he will revert to the old method of quarterly payments.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): My attention has been called to this matter. It is not correct to say that the annual grant has ever been paid on a regular system of quarterly instalments. Ever since the first establishment of the annual grant, forty years ago, it has been paid after the close of the year, and I am not aware that any confusion has thereby been occasioned. But in each of the last three financial years a partial and essentially temporary expedient has been resorted to, by which certain limited sums have in certain cases been paid in advance. The subject is extremely technical and complicated, and the Board of Education are at present making a special investigation into what changes (if any) could properly be made in the method of payments to local authorities in respect of elementary education.

Securing of Seats in the House—Midnight Arrivals.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware that when hon. Members on two recent occasions visited this House at midnight for the purpose of securing their seats, the Chamber and approaches thereto were in darkness, and that the request of Members to have them lighted was refused by the officers in charge; whether he can say who is responsible for this state of things; and will he see that in future Members are afforded light when they, in the exercise of their rights, desire to visit the House at night.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): On the two occasions referred to by the hon. Member, the usual practice was followed as regards the lighting of the main approaches, lobbies, etc., to the Chamber; in fact, there were more lamps in lighting than usual. The Department responsible had no knowledge of any request for further lighting by

Members. The Debating Chamber has not hitherto been lit upon occasions of a similar character. I much regret any inconvenience caused to Members. I have given instructions that in future any reasonable request for temporary light in the Chamber of the House itself shall be immediately complied with.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): Are Members entitled to come down here at midnight and secure a seat unless they are prepared to stay within the precincts of the House until the House meets? Ought not the rules on the card to be observed.

*Mr. SPEAKER said the rule was printed upon the card, and was printed there not for the purpose of being broken, but for the purpose of being complied with. The rule was very clearly stated upon the card, and if hon. Members would look at it they would see the conditions under which they were entitled to place a card upon a seat and to take that seat at prayers.

Mr. EUGENE WASON: I came down here for the first time at five o'clock in the morning and found no Members within the precincts of the House, although every single seat on both sides had been taken.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): Seeing it was not possible for Members coming down at midnight to remain, would it not be advisable to prohibit the taking of seats before a reasonable hour?

*Mr. SPEAKER said that the occasions upon which seats were taken at midnight occurred very rarely, once or twice in the course of the session, and he thought there had generally been a tacit understanding that the rule should not be enforced upon those occasions. Of course it would be quite improper that, if the House were to rise at midnight, Members should then proceed to secure their places and go home, and come back again here at two o'clock and expect to find their seats allotted to them.

Sale of Bills Office.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware of the inconvenience to Members of this House due to the Sale Office for Bills being situated in a remote part of Westminster Hall; and whether he will consider, as a means to remedy this inconvenience, the transfer of the Sale Department to the Vote Office in the lobby.

Mr. HARCOURT: The Vote Office is already too small for the business carried on in it. But I will consult the authorities of the House as to whether any more convenient arrangement can be made for the Sale Department.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to appoint a Committee to consider the whole subject of the arrangements of the House.

Mr. HARCOURT: The arrangements rest with the authorities, whom I will consult in the matter.

Roscommon County Councils and the Financial Year.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the county council of Roscommon has passed a resolution in favour of changing the date of the termination of the financial year for the purpose of local government in Ireland from 31st March to 31st December, that this resolution has been adopted by several other Irish county councils, and that the Local Government Board has declared this change can be effected only by an Act of Parliament; and, if so, whether he is prepared to introduce the legislation necessary to give effect to the views of the public bodies entrusted with the duties of local administration.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.): The facts are as stated in the Question, The financial half-years of county and district councils are fixed as terminating on 30th September and 31st March by the Local Government (Ireland) Act 1898, and the Privy Council orders made thereunder, and an alteration of these dates could only be effected by legislation. The Local Government Board are not aware that any useful purpose would be served by a change of date.

Cork Butter Trade.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if his attention has been drawn to a resolution of the Cork County Council calling for inquiry into the qualifications as an expert of Lord Ikerrin, recently appointed by the Department of Agriculture as a Commissioner for the protection of Irish butter against fraudulent imitation and adulteration; how soon the inquiry may be expected to take place; and whether, having regard to the importance of the butter-producing industry in the south, the representatives of the people on the county councils will have any share in the proposed inquiry.

MR. BRYCE: The hon. Member seems to be under a misapprehension as to the nature of the inquiry. It is to be one made by myself with some assistance, but it will not be in the nature of a body on which any representative authority could be appointed. I hope very soon to be able to announce the date at which it will begin—possibly in the course of next week.

County Infirmary Committees.

MR. HAYDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that much inconvenience is caused to officials and the public in Ireland through the difficulty of finding a quorum to attend the meetings of county infirmary committees, and that a large number of meetings that had been summoned have fallen through owing to the failure of a quorum to attend; and whether, in view of these facts, he will, either by change of rule or by legislation, if this be necessary, secure a reduction in the number of members making a quorum at meetings of those committees.

MR. BRYCE: The Local Government Board have no information to the effect mentioned in the first part of the Question. The quorum of Infirmary Committees is fixed at five, which in no case is more than a third of the members, while the average number of the committees is about twenty-two. A change in the number of the quorum could only be effected by legislation, and the Board have not evidence to show that a necessity has arisen for altering the present number, which cannot be regarded as excessive. The objections to having a very small quorum are obvious.

Use of Irish Language.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a decision given in the King's Bench Division at Dublin on the 13th instant declaring that it was a violation of the law to inscribe the name of the owner upon a vehicle in the Irish language, although Roman characters were used; and what course the police authorities will pursue to ensure due compliance with the law.

MR. BRYCE: I am advised that the effect of the decision of the King's Bench Division is correctly stated in the Question. The police authorities will endeavour to secure that the main object of the law, viz., the ascertainment of the ownership of a vehicle by which any damage is done, is duly secured; and it will be a question in each particular case what steps may best be taken for that purpose.

*MR. LONSDALE: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the House an assurance that the names shall appear in the language spoken in the country.

MR. BRYCE: I think it desirable that the names should be printed legibly and intelligibly. The object is to secure that the owner shall be recognisable.

MR. LONSDALE: If the name is in Irish characters will the police be able to recognise it?

MR. BRYCE: I have stated what their instructions are.

Hickman Estate, County Clare.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a tenant purchaser on the Hickman Estate in county Clare has been sent to gaol at Carrigaholt Petty Sessions on February 8th for shooting on his farm, as he thought he had a right to do; and when fined 10s. with the alternative of a week in gaol, he asked to have the fine increased to enable him to appeal, the resident magistrate refused; and whether he will cause an inquiry into the matter.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed that in this case Patrick Cahill was convicted, not for shooting on his own farm, but for killing rabbits on a farm which is specially used by the landlord for the breeding of rabbits. I have no information that the defendant asked to have the fine increased in order that he might appeal, but in any event that question was one for the magistrates to decide. I have no power to order an inquiry into the matter.

MR. HALPIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the resident magistrates to discontinue the objectionable practice of preventing appeals?

MR. BRYCE: I have no power to give such instructions.

Irish Language in Irish Schools.

*MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, what are the educational grounds on which it has been decided to restore the extra grant for teaching Irish in the national schools of Ireland; and further, whether the great majority of children attending national schools in Ireland leave school at a very early age; and whether he will state what practical benefit these children will derive from a study of the Irish language during hours which might be used for more profitable instruction.

MR. BRYCE: It is not the fact that the great majority of children attending national schools in Ireland leave at a very early age. The average age of leaving does not substantially differ from that in England, though the attendance is much more irregular. The proposals for aiding the teaching of the Irish language, which are at present the subject of communications between myself and the National Board and the Treasury, do not contemplate the restoration of the same extra grant which it was decided last year to withdraw. They are intended to provide more effective methods of aiding the study of Irish, which will, it is hoped, give better results. That study ought not, however, to be allowed to interfere with the necessary subjects of elementary instruction. It is impossible, within the limits of an Answer to a Question, to state the grounds which lead me to believe that the teaching of Irish has a real educational value, but I shall be prepared to explain them on a proper occasion.

MR. J. REDMOND (Waterford): When does the right hon. Gentleman hope to be in a position to explain his scheme?

MR. BRYCE: In the course of the next few weeks.

Outrage in County Derry.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a barn belonging to Mr. Robert Bailey, of View Forth, Cross, county Derry, was fired, and valuable property destroyed, immediately after the election for North Derry; and if any clue to the perpetrators of this outrage is in the hands of the police.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): Is there any ground for suggesting that the fire was caused otherwise than by accident. Is not Londonderry one of the most peaceful counties in Ireland?

MR. BRYCE: On the night of the 31st January, a barn with its contents, and a rick of hay, Mr. Bailey's property, were destroyed by fire; and a heifer, also his property, was found dead with its throat cut. The police have made every effort to discover the perpetrators of these outrages, but so far without success. They are still pursuing their investigation of the matter. It is quite true that Londonderry is usually a peaceful county, but I am sorry to say there is some reason to believe that this outrage had a political object.

Infantile Mortality in the North Dublin Workhouse.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the rate of infantile mortality within the North Dublin Union Workhouse as disclosed by the recent Local Government Board inquiry into the subject.

Mr. BRYCE: During the three years ending June 30th, 1904, there were, approximately, 333 deaths of children under two years of age in the two nurseries of this workhouse, and of the children transferred to extern hospitals 69 died, so that the total number of deaths was about 402 out of probably less than 1,000 children. As a result of the Local Government Board medical inspector's inquiry in the matter, considerable improvements have been made in the structure and administration of the infant department.

Jeremiah Dunne's Estate, Queen's County.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a memorial has been received by the Estates Commissioners sent on behalf of small holders residing at Aughabol. Queen's County, requesting the purchase for the purpose of redistribution, of the estate of the late Jeremiah Dunne, at present for sale in the Land Judges' Court; and whether, as this estate is all untenanted land, he can say what steps are being taken in the matter.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received the memorial referred to, and have made an offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the unsold lots of the estate in question. I am informed that the Commissioners' offer, with other offers which have been received will shortly come before the Land Judge for consideration.

Mr. DELANY: The sale takes place next Monday.

Clonkeen Eviction.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of the police force which assisted at the eviction of Joseph Brock and his family at Clonkeen, Queen's County, on the 14th instant; what was the cost in connection therewith; and whether any part of the expense will fall upon local rates.

Mr. BRYCE: The police force assembled for the preservation of the peace consisted of three officers and fifty men, drawn from the established force of the county. The only cost incurred was £6 14s. 3d., the travelling and subsistence expenses of the men. No part of the expense will fall on local rates.

Irish Local Government Board.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the work of the various public bodies created by the Local Government Act of 1898 is often needlessly hampered by the rulings of the Local Government Board, the Government will consider the advisability of widening the constitution of that body and introducing into it some element of popular representation.

Mr. BRYCE: It cannot be admitted that the work of public bodies is needlessly hampered by the Local Government Board. The hon. Member is probably thinking of cases in which the Board, in virtue of their statutory obligations, have necessarily to interfere with the action of local bodies. I am not at present prepared to make any statement on the point mentioned in the latter part of the Question.

Limerick Postman's Grievance.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, whether his attention has been called to the fact that the office of inspector of postmen at Limerick has been vacant since last July; and whether, seeing that there is a senior man of thirty years' service without an offence against him capable of filling the post, he will have the appointment made.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. S. Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The office of inspector of postmen at Limerick has been vacant since July last.

A senior postman is being tried on the duties, and the question of his appointment depends upon the manner in which he performs them. A report on the subject is to be made to me shortly.

Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Disorders.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, if he can say when the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Disorders will issue its Report.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My hon. friend of course is aware that the Government have no control over the proceedings of Royal Commissions; but I understand from the Chairman of the Commission, Lord St. Aldwyn, that the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline have made great progress with the consideration of their Report, and although he cannot yet name any definite date at which it will be presented he hopes that it will be completed by Whitsuntide.

System of Taking Divisions in the House.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, if he will consider the desirability of appointing a Committee to inquire into the practicability of adopting some improved method of taking divisions so as to obviate the delay and inconvenience arising from the crowded state of the lobbies.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I agree with my hon. friend that the present mode of taking divisions is cumbrous, tedious and inconvenient; but no one has yet devised a better. It is a subject which may well be considered and it will be kept in view in any general review of the procedure of the House.

Parliamentary Elections—Machinery and Second Ballot.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view to future electoral legislation, he will consider the advisability of inquiring, by Select or Departmental Committee or Commission, into the expenses and machinery of Parliamentary Elections, and especially into recent evidence as to the working of the second ballot in other countries and the possibility of introducing some form of the second ballot in Parliamentary Elections in the United Kingdom.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government will consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

County Magistracy.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Government intend to accept and act upon the Resolution passed by this House on May 5th, 1893, with regard to the appointments to the county magistracy.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Resolution of 1893 referred to in the Question, which was concurred in by the Government then in power, expresses the view of His Majesty's present Government, and that view will of course be acted upon when the occasion requires it.

The Ladies' Gallery—The Grille.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider whether the time has now come when the brass trellis in front of the Ladies' Gallery might safely be removed; and if he will give the House an opportunity of expressing its view of this matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware that the question of safety has ever entered into the consideration of this matter. It is a question of comfort and convenience, and upon this point varying opinions have again and again been expressed with great confidence. I am not sure that a new House, with a very large proportion of Members who have no practical knowledge of the facts, would be an authoritative judge in the ancient controversy.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware of the fact that on two previous occasions the opinion of the occupants of the Ladies' Gallery was taken, and whether that opinion was not on both occasions in favour of retaining the grating?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not as well acquainted with the opinions of the Ladies' Gallery as my hon. friend appears to be. As far as my slight acquaintance with these things goes, I have heard opinions strongly expressed on either side of the question; and my own opinion, if I might put it forward, is that there is much more inconvenience caused by the heavy mullions which interpose themselves between the occupants of the Ladies' Gallery and the Members of the House than by the grating itself. But I do not think we can determine a matter like this by the opinions of the occupants of the Ladies' Gallery gathered casually on some particular occasion.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of admitting ladies to the galleries of the House on the same terms as men?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That has been often suggested and discussed in the House; and I think the general experience and opinion have been against it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there any occasion for the four notices in the Ladies' Gallery commanding silence, when there is none in any other part of the House?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware of it, but there must be some mysterious reason.

The Fiscal Debate.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the opinion of the nation on the fiscal controversy so clearly expressed at the recent General Election, he will refuse to give any of the Government time for the discussion of any Motion thereon unless asked for by the responsible Leaders of the Opposition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that my hon. friend the Member for the Colne Valley Division proposes to move a Resolution affirming the decision expressed in the recent election on the fiscal question; and I have already stated that as we consider it desirable that the House should have this opportunity, a day will be given for the purpose.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked why the Member for Colne Valley could not take his chance in the ballot with other private Members, and whether it was fair to waste two days on a matter concerning which the opinions of the House were very well known.

[No Answer was returned.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) asked whether the Prime Minister anticipated a rapid end to the debate on the Address, so that the House could get to work; and what would the course of business be next week.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Looking at the Order Paper, there seems no doubt that the Address may be voted on Monday night at the latest, and the Government will endeavour to bring the discussion to an end then. On the morning sittings of Tuesday and Wednesday Supplementary Estimates will be taken and some minor Bills will be introduced. Thursday we propose to devote to the Free Trade Resolution, which I think it is desirable that the House should have an opportunity of discussing. On Monday, 5th March, we intend to move the Speaker out of the Chair on Navy Estimates. We shall see how we proceed with regard to the progress of financial business, a great deal of which must be got through before 25th March; but in order, if possible, to avoid encroachment upon the privileges of private Members, we may have once or twice to move the suspension of the 12 o'clock rule. We intend, however, to abstain from such action as much as possible.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I take no exception whatever to the statement of the Prime Minister that he regarded the fiscal question as of so much importance as to justify a special debate, but I think that when the right hon. Gentleman referred to the matter on Monday he spoke of giving two days.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No; a day.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say two days. Having regard, however, to the importance which he himself attaches to the subject, I think that the right hon. Gentleman is rather sanguine if he anticipates that a proper discussion can possibly be concluded in a single day. I merely put in that *caveat*. As to the duration of the Address debate, in recent years the discussion has usually occupied two weeks or more. I would personally be glad if a precedent could be made for closing such debates within a shorter period in any circumstances, but I should think it rather unfair if a precedent were made harshly and suddenly against the minority whom I represent. I hope therefore that, if matters of importance still remain, the right hon. Gentleman will not hold too strictly to the intention he has now declared.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The House necessarily met later this session than in recent years owing to the General Election. I think, therefore, that when the right hon. Gentleman remembers that the financial business must be closed before a certain day, he will see that it was not unreasonable to quicken, if possible, the progress of the Address debate.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Education Bill will be brought in?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir.

NEW BILLS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDERS BILL.

"To deal with Ecclesiastical Disorders in the Church of England," presented by Mr. Carlile; supported by Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Channing, Dr. Hazell, Mr. David MacIver, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. W. W. Rutherford, Colonel Sandys, Major Seely, and Mr. Austin Taylor; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 2].

LAND TENURE BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Tenure of Land," presented by Mr. Agar-Robartes; supported by Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Soares, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Hay Morgan, Mr. Newnes, and Mr. Montagu; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 3].

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To provide for the Taxation for local purposes of Land Values in Scotland and for the compulsory Acquisition of Land by Local Authorities in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Sutherland; supported by Mr. Cleland, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Findlay, Mr. John Hope, Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Watt, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to beprinted. [Bill 4].

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Trades Unions and Trade and other Disputes," presented by Mr. Hudson; supported by Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Wilkie, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Gill, Mr. Snowden, Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Hodge, and Mr. Walsh; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 5].

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Diseases of Animals Act, 1896, with regard to the importation of Canadian live cattle," presented by Mr. Cairns; supported by Mr. H. Greenwood, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. J. Allen Baker, Mr. Hubert Beaumont, and Mr. Halley Stewart; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 6].

LIGHT DUES (ABOLITION BILL).

"To abolish Light Dues now chargeable on ships in the United Kingdom," presented by Sir Robert Ropner; supported by Mr. Russell Rea, Mr. James Walton, Mr. Cairns, Mr. Walter Rea, Mr. Houston, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Lambton, and Mr. Charles Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 7.]

PURE BEER BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the manufacture and sale of Beer," presented by Mr. Courthope; supported by Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Mr. Bridgeman, and Mr. Robert Price; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 8.]

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, and otherwise to facilitate the building of Houses for the Working Classes in rural districts," presented by Mr. Mackarness; supported by Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Channing, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. Soames, Mr. Rowlands, Mr. Strauss, and Mr. Morrell; to be read a second time upon Friday, 27th April, and to be printed. [Bill 9].

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

"To amend the Education Acts, 1902 and 1903" presented by Mr. W. T. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 10.]

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

"To limit the hours of work below ground in Coal Mines," presented by Mr. Brunner; supported by Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Norman, Mr. Joseph Walton, Mr. Hall, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. John Hope, and Mr. Howell Davies; to be read a second time upon Friday, 11th May, and to be printed. [Bill 11].

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To improve the position of Tenants in Towns in Ireland," presented by Mr. M'Killop; supported by Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Charles Devlin, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; to be read a second time upon Friday, 18th May, and to be printed. [Bill 12.]

PILOTAGE BILL.

"To amend The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in respect of Pilotage Certificates," presented by Mr. Howell Davies; supported by Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Godfrey Baring, Sir William Evans-Gordon, Mr. Bateman Hope, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Levy Lever, Sir George Newnes, and Sir Gilbert Parker; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 13.]

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) BILL.

"To enable Women to be elected and act as members of county and borough councils and Metropolitan borough councils," presented by Mr. Silcock; supported by Dr. Shipman, Mr. Alden, Mr. Channing. Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Henderson Mr. Spicer, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. H. J. Wilson, and Mr. Yoxall; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 14.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To deal with the Registration of Voters in Ireland," presented by Mr. Charles Devlin; supported by Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Doogan, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Mooney, and Mr. Kennedy; to be read a second time upon Friday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 15.]

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL

"To amend the Law relating to Coal Mines," presented by Mr. Compton Rickett; supported by Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Wadsworth, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Brace, Mr. Walton, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Glover, and Mr. Jacoby; to be read a second time upon Friday, 11th May, and to be printed. [Bill 16.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Local Government (Ireland) Acts," presented by Mr. Joseph Devlin; supported by Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh;

Mr. Conor O'Kelly, Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th June, and to be printed. [Bill 17.]

OLD AGE PENSIONS BILL.

"To provide Pensions for the Aged Deserving Poor," presented by Mr. J. W. Wilson; supported by Mr. Goddard, Mr. Claude Hay, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Mr. W. H. Lever, Mr. Remnant, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 18.]

ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

"To grant Certificates to Persons in charge of Engines and Boilers in and about Mines," presented by Mr. William Johnson; supported by Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Bell, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Wilson, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Walton, Mr. Compton Rickett, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Cameron, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Enoch Edwards; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 19.]

COMPULSORY WEIGHING AND MEASUREMENT BILL.

"To provide for the Weighing and Measurement of the material used in the process of manufacture, as well as the product thereof, in all iron or steel works, cement works, lime works, and chalk quarries," presented by Mr. Barnes; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 20.]

CONTEMPT OF COURT (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Contempt of Court in Ireland," presented by Mr. Nolan; supported by Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Farrell; to be read a second time upon Friday, 4th May, and to be printed. [Bill 21.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL) BILL.

"To remove certain Disqualifications at Parliamentary Elections," presented by Mr. Marnham; supported by Mr. Croydon Marks, Mr. Cowan, and Mr. Brodie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 22.]

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister," presented by Mr. Barker; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 23.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLL) BILL.

"To extend the Hours of Polling at Parliamentary Elections," presented by Mr. Pickersgill; supported by Sir Edwin Cornwall, Mr. Dickinson, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. B. S. Straus, and Mr. Wiles; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March and to be printed. [Bill 24.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1889) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889," presented by Major Anstruther-Gray; supported by Mr. George Younger, Mr. Cochrane, Sir John Tuke, and Mr. Eugene Wason; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 25.]

MARINE WORKS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To deal with Marine Works in Ireland," presented by Mr. O'Hare; supported by Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Joyce, Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. O'Malley, and Mr. M'Killop; to be read a second time upon Friday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 26.]

IRISH LIGHTS COMMISSION BILL.

"To amend the constitution of the Irish Lights Commission," presented by Mr. Mooney; supported by Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Field; to be read a second time upon Friday, 8th June, and to be printed. [Bill 27.]

AGED PENSIONERS BILL.

"To provide Pensions for the Aged Deserving Poor," presented by Mr. Samuel Roberts; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 28.]

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

"To establish a Single Franchise at all Elections and thereby to abolish

University Representation and to remove the Disabilities of Women," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Byles, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Money, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Sheehan, and Mr. P. W. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 29.]

METROPOLITAN POLICE (DUBLIN) BILL.

"To deal with the Metropolitan Police in Dublin," presented by Mr. Kennedy, supported by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Waldron, and Mr. Field; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 30.]

WAGES BOARDS BILL.

"To provide for the establishment of Wages Boards," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Alden, Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Masterton, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Harold Tennant, Mr. Trevelyan, and Mr. P. W. Wilson; to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 31.]

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES (NO. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Trades Unions and Trade Disputes," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Keir Hardie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 32.]

PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND EXECUTOR BILL.

"To provide for the appointment of a Public Trustee and Executor," presented by Sir C. E. Howard Vincent; supported by Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Isaacs, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Broadhurst, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 33.]

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

"To amend the sixteenth section of The Merchandise Marks Act, 1887," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Middlemore, Sir Frederick Carne Rasch, Mr. Field, Sir Benjamin Stone, Sir Francis Lowe, and Mr. Parkes; to be read a second time upon Friday, 2nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 34.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To make further provision for Local Government in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. George Younger; supported by Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Eugene Wason, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. W. M. Thomson, and Mr. Crombie; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 35.]

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To provide for the later opening of premises licensed for the sale of excisable liquors in Scotland," presented by Mr. Findlay; supported by Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Robert Balfour, Mr. Cross, Mr. Gulland, and Mr. Sutherland; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 8th March, and to be printed. [Bill 36.]

TRAWLERS' CERTIFICATES SUSPENSION BILL.

"To enable Courts to suspend the Certificates of Trawlers convicted of illegal Trawling," presented by Mr. Weir; supported by Mr. Morton, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Black, Mr. Annan Bryce, and Mr. Sutherland; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 37.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland on Saturdays and Sundays; and for other purposes connected therewith, presented by Mr. Sloan; supported by Mr. William Redmond, Captain Donelan, Mr. Gordon, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Glendinning, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Thomas Smyth;" to be read a second time upon Friday, 25th May, and to be printed. [Bill 38.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900," presented by Mr.

Jackson; supported by Mr. Nield, Mr. Idris, Mr. Waterlow, and Mr. Money; to be read a second time upon Friday, 27th April, and to be printed. [Bill 39.]

VOTING DISQUALIFICATION (POOR LAW) REMOVAL BILL.

"To prevent the disfranchisement of persons receiving Poor Law Relief," presented by Mr. Charles E. Schwann; supported by Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Brotherton, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Mr. J. M. Robertson, and Mr. John Johnson; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 40.]

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881, and to make further provision for the sale of intoxicating liquors in Wales and Monmouthshire," presented by Mr. Herbert Roberts; supported by Sir Alfred Thomas and Mr. William Jones; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 41.]

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

"To provide for the Assessment and Rating of Land Values," presented by Mr. Trevelyan; supported by Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Bell, Sir John Brunner, Mr. William Jones, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. McCrae, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Whitley, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 42.]

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) moved the following Amendment—

> "But we humbly regret that your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenor of your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end."

He said he thought it very desirable to focus attention on this question which had been prominently before the public during the last two years and especially during the last two months. It had been said over and over again by members of the present Ministry and their supporters that the late Government had been guilty of a great wrong, and had been instrumental in casting a slur upon the honour of this country, in sanctioning the introduction of Chinese labour into South Africa. That was a serious charge to make. It was a charge that ought not to have been made unless the people who made it believed in it, and it ought not to have been made unless it was capable of proof. One of the most astounding things in the whole of this agitation was that there had been no proof to back up the assertion. On the contrary, the whole body of opinion entertained by people who really knew the conditions and had seen the coolies at work went to prove that hon. Gentlemen opposite were wrong in asserting with so much confidence that the conditions were tantamount to slavery. Business men, working men engaged in the mines, trade union officials, ministers of religion, the members of the British Association visiting South Africa last autumn, and even some supporters of the present Government themselves who had been out there, all said there was no element of slavery in the conditions under which the Chinamen worked, and that the arrangements were healthy, humane, and admirable in every way. Yet, in spite of this great body of evidence from those who had been on the spot, various

Ministers still persisted in their allegations that the conditions amounted to slavery. The present Minister for Education, for instance, speaking at Bristol last September, said Liberals had a grave responsibility in this matter; they must wash their hands of it entirely, for it was part of the creed of Liberals that under the British flag slavery in whatever form and under whatever guise should not exist. This right hon. Gentleman had been closely associated with, even if not primarily responsible for, the literature which had been designed to educate the electors during the past two of three years; and if he proposed to apply to the education of the children of the country the methods which he had applied to the education of their parents, they would be hard put to it to tell right from wrong, justice from injustice, fact from fiction. Then there was another right hon. Gentleman who, in spite of everything that had been published to the contrary, still adhered, so far as he knew, to his opinion that the conditions under which the Chinese worked amounted to slavery. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade in his election address expressed his opinion that Chinese labour was unnecessary for South Africa, especially in the enslaved, underhand abominably created form in which it did now exist. He added—

> "I am against slavery, coolie, indentured, contract, or coloured labour for British South Africa."

At the time that address was issued, colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman were making it clear that they did not regard the conditions under which the Chinese laboured as tantamount to slavery, and it certainly appeared that as their hopes of office came nearer realisation they were modifying their language, and probably their opinions. But the right hon. Gentleman had had the courage to stick to the opinion which he had expressed from the first, and to which no doubt he would adhere to his dying day: viz., that the Chinese in South Africa are slaves.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Is not the hon. Gentleman referring to myself, rather than to the President of the Board of Trade?

MR. FORSTER said he was addressing his remarks to the President of the Local Government Board. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman opposite would forgive him if he had wrongfully addressed him. He would now quote what was said by the President of the Board of Trade. He regretted having to quote the speeches of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who were not in their places. He wished to remind the House of the opinions they expressed in their speeches because he thought it was desirable that the country should not forget the kind of speeches they made. In view of the contents of the Blue Book which had been published within the last two days, the country would be able to realise the real and proper worth of the opinions which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite had expressed. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, speaking at Pwllheli in reference to the treatment of Chinese coolies, said—

> "They were kept like dogs in a kennel; they were treated as very few men treated their beasts, and if you treated a man as a beast, he became a beast."

In the same speech the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that—

> "Those people who were trying to use the unemployed statistics of this country in support of a new fiscal system were the very people who introduced 65,000 Chinamen on cheap terms to South Africa, which was as integral a part of this Empire as Carnarvonshire, under conditions tantamount to slavery."

That was one of the exuberant exaggerations of the right hon. Gentleman, because at the time he was speaking he overstated the case by something like 20,000. The right hon. Gentleman would probably say that that did not affect the argument. He himself did not think it did. The argument would remain the same if it was applied to only one Chinaman. He only mentioned it to show the kind of exaggeration in which the right hon. Gentleman had so often indulged.

*MR. CHURCHILL: What was the exaggeration?

Mr. FORSTER: What was the number of Chinese in South Africa on 17th January, 1906?

Mr. CHURCHILL: There were 47,000, and others were under contract to come.

Mr. FORSTER said he would not argue that matter. The right hon. Gentleman used the word "introduced," and the argument remained the same. The President of the Board of Trade in the same speech asked—

> "What would they say to introducing Chinamen at one shilling a day to the Welsh quarries? Why, Chinese labour could make the gold mines of Merioneth do what Mr. Pritchard Morgan once said they would do—extinguish the National Debt. Slavery on the hills of Wales! Heaven forgive him for the suggestion."

That was a prayer in which all would agree, for nothing could be more misleading than for a man in the right hon. Gentleman's position to suggest to his constituents that there was the slightest risk of the importation of cheap Chinese labour into this country to displace our own workmen. [Cries of "Why not?" and "We have Poles in Scotland."] Was the hon. Member who said "Why not?" so blind to the force of public opinion? [Cries of "No."] Then he would know why there was no danger of Chinese labour coming into this country. If the President of the Board of Trade had adopted the same line as the hon. Gentleman below the gangway, and, instead of suggesting to his constituents that there was grave risk of Chinamen coming into this country, had pointed out that public opinion would never tolerate them in this country——.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Why in South Africa?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member for East St. Pancras not to keep interrupting. It is one of the great boasts of this House that we listen to the speeches and then reply to them.

Mr. FORSTER said he made no complaint of the way in which the hon. Gentleman had treated him. He knew that this question excited strong feeling, but he was sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite would bear with him although he might say things with which they did not agree. At the very moment when these hon. and right hon. Gentlemen were making these speeches to their constituents they must have known that the conditions which they were describing in such hard terms were in reality of a milder, far fairer, and far juster character. What was the system which they had so fiercely attacked and denounced? It was a system under which the labourer enlisted in his own country and at his own will for a limited period of service. It was a system under which all the conditions of this employment had to be clearly and adequately explained to him before his service was accepted. It was a system under which he was able to terminate his engagement at any moment. It was a system under which he was able to earn far higher wages than he could earn at the same class of labour in his own country. There was not an element of slavery in any one of the conditions. But he would be told that the coolies had to live in a compound. It was, he thought, the Postmaster-General who, in describing the conditions of the Chinese coolie, referred to them as living under lock and key. He referred to that as showing the exaggeration which could be employed in describing a Chinese compound. He asked the House to take the testimony of people who had been in these compounds and who had seen the Chinamen there. So far from it being fair to say that the Chinese were kept in these compounds under lock and key, with all the restrictions described, it would be found that life in the compounds was far more tolerable and contained a far greater element of freedom than many of our own soldiers enjoyed. [Cries of "No."] The country had rung with denunciations of the compound system which the late Government had tolerated for four or five years. Did hon. Members forget that Kaffirs lived in compounds? If the compound system was so monstrous and iniquitous at the present moment why did they not denounce it years before? Why was it that they were content to allow the compound system to grow up and develop when the compounds were occupied by Kaffirs, and only became so tender in their consciences when they were inhabited by Chinese? Some hon. Members opposite said that although it might be true that the actual conditions of employment and life in compounds were not tantamount to slavery, yet the ill-treatment to which the Chinese had been subjected was so barbarous and so horrible as to amount to one of the conditions of slavery. He maintained that the Blue Book just published contained an absolute refutation of that charge. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] He was expressing his own opinion. The Colonial Secretary on 16th January telegraphed for information with regard to the treatment of the Chinese coolies because he felt that the time had come when Parliament would demand further information. Lord Selborne replied that—

> "The inspectors are carrying out the instructions which have been given to them to the best of their ability, and no complaint by any coolie ever remains uninvestigated."

He thought one of the things which had animated the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite was the feeling that these coolies might be ill-treated by their employers, and that the facts would not be brought to light. Very well, the object which Lord Selborne had in view, and which the late Government had in view, as to appoint inspectors to take every step that could be taken to ensure that no coolie should run the risk of harsh or unjust treatment without having his case investigated and the offender brought to justice. Lord Selborne was able to say that—

> "No complaint by any coolie remains uninvestigated. The chief difficulty with which the inspectors have to contend is that in many cases where grievances are believed to exist the aggrieved person himself prefers to maintain silence. It is obviously impossible to expect the inspectors fully to elucidate the facts with regard to such cases."

And then his Lordship went on to say that—

> "Proclamations in Chinese setting forth the machinery provided by law for the settlement of disputes are posted in every compound, and the Superintendent of Foreign Labour has good grounds for believing that they are carefully studied. Petitions duly lodged by the coolies in the petition boxes provided under Government regulations on every mine or sent in to the Superintendent in town are closely investigated."

These petition boxes, he might remind the House, were introduced in order to meet the danger which coolies might feel in making complaints. The coolies might put their petitions in these boxes, and they ran no risk of any evil consequence following by so doing. It would be interesting to know to what extent they had availed themselves of this privilege. The Colonial Secretary wanted to know something about the Chinese native police employed in the compounds, what their functions were, and what kind of men they were. Lord Selborne had given that information—

> "The Chinese compound police are men recruited by the mining companies as indentured labourers. For the most part they have served either in the British Army at Wei-hai-Wei or in the Chinese Army."

It might be presumed that they understood and were able to deal with their own fellow-countrymen whom they got to know on board ship before their arrival in South Africa, and Lord Selborne justified their use as satisfactory. His words were—

> "It speaks very highly indeed for the police and for the coolies that order has been maintained as well as it has been."

And his Lordship pointed out that although these—

> "Chinese police were no more perfect than any other human beings . . . all things considered, I am not of opinion that they have on the whole acted in an oppressive manner towards the coolies, nor do I believe that it is the opinion of the coolies that they have done so."

And he pointed out that if two Chinamen had a quarrel they settled it amongst themselves, and if one of them got beaten, the beaten party declined to give any information to the inspector in regard to the matter. Lord Selborne called attention to this matter because he thought that some allegations which had been made in the Press in this country and had been repeated in speeches by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, had been founded on the treatment by the Chinese themselves and not on any treatment which the Chinese coolies had received at the hands of their employers or their representatives. Lord Selborne said—and in this he shared his Lordship's view to the full—

> "I feel bound to add that although I fully recognise your anxiety to receive specific assurances that the arrangements for the protection of the Chinese coolies and for ensuring their proper treatment are as perfect

as it is possible to make them, the Superintendent of Foreign Labour deeply resents the insinuations made by irresponsible persons that the coolies are ill-treated, which insinuations imply that he fails in his duty of seeing that their treatment is good."

He was not surprised that anyone holding a position of responsibility and authority in South Africa should feel and deeply resent the insinuations made against him in the speeches delivered by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. He himself felt deeply the line which right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite had taken up on this question in the past few years. He, however, was able to exchange views with them personally face to face; but the officials who were engaged 6,000 miles away in carrying out the Ordinance, and whose business it was to see justice done to the coolies in South Africa, had no means of stating their side of the case to right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. He was accordingly not surprised that these officials keenly and strongly resented the imputations freely cast upon them during the last few years. Now, they all knew, and he thought that the country would very soon find out, why it was that this great outcry about Chinese labour had been raised, and why it had commended itself so strongly to right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had never heard before about other Ordinances regarding coolie labour in other Colonies. They had never heard any outcry against the people of Australia when they dealt with Kanaka labour. [MINISTERIAL cries of dissent.] Was the British Government then charged with sanctioning slavery in a British colony? No, not for one moment did hon. Gentlemen opposite attach the same importance to the Kanaka question as they did to the Chinese question because, they did not realise what a strong and potent weapon it would be in their hands for party purposes at a general election. It had been interesting to see the course of events operating on the minds of hon. and more especially right hon. Gentlemen during the past few years. They had seen that the violence of their opinions and of their speeches had gradually moderated until hon. Gentlemen, who had started by asserting frankly and plainly that they regarded Chinese labour as slavery, had now come to the conclusion that in all the circumstances of the case they would leave the settlement of the question to the Transvaal itself. If they really believed that the condition of the Chinese labourers amounted to slavery it was their business to deal with it—[MINISTERIAL cheers]—yes, and to deal with it in a way which would be commensurate with the gravity of the charge made. The right hon. the Prime Minister, speaking in this House only two or three days ago, said that His Majesty's Government felt it their duty as long as any responsibility rested with them for the administration of the Ordinance to secure, as far as possible, that no Chinese coolie who honestly and genuinely desired to return to his home should be retained in the Transvaal against his will and at work in the mines. That was a statement of policy with which, he should think, the whole House would agree. No one wanted to keep the Chinese coolies in South Africa against their will; and a special clause was put in the Ordinance which gave the coolies the right to terminate their engagement at any time on condition only of finding the money for their return to China. [MINISTERIAL ironical laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite quarrelled with the means, but they did not quarrel with the intention of the Ordinance. He thought that all of them could agree with the object which the right hon. Gentleman had in view. And there was a passage in the despatch of Lord Selborne which showed that those who were responsible in South Africa fully agreed with the view expressed by the right hon. Gentleman. But while Lord Selborne agreed with that policy, he pointed out the dangers that would undoubtedly be connected with it when an effort was made to put that policy in force; and he most wisely proposed to limit it to those cases in which the Government and the Lieutenant-Governor were fully satisfied that the coolie who was going to be sent home, to a certain extent at the public cost, should not return to South Africa under any new engagement. On page 106, paragraph 4, Lord Selborne said that—

"There may be exceptional cases in which it would be reasonable for the Government to incur this expenditure, but they ought to be cases recommended by the Superintendent and approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

He entirely agreed with the reservation that Lord Selborne made, and he gathered that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister approved of it also. Lord Selborne pointed out also the feeling which undoubtedly would be aroused in the minds of the people who, from the Blue-book, it appeared, were apparently to pay the cost. The right hon. Gentleman said that the charge was to be met out of public funds, but he did not tell them what those public funds were, and whether the charge was to come upon the Transvaal or this country. He hoped the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary would tell them what was intended, as it would have a very distinct bearing upon the point, and his explanation might go a considerable way to alleviate the danger which Lord Selborne felt might arise by the refusal of the Transvaal Government to vote the necessary money. Again, as Lord Selborne pointed out, if they once recognised the principle that any man who had gone to South Africa under a contract of any sort was to be able to come to the Government and say, "I am tired of it; I am tired of working in South Africa; I hate the country; I want to go back to my own country, and I have not got the means to do it,"—if they once admitted the principle that these men were to be assisted out of public money, where would the practice stop? He hoped the Under-Secretary, therefore, would tell them whether he proposed to adopt the recommendations of Lord Selborne that this power should only be exercised in cases which were recommended by the Superintendent and approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. They now knew the policy which the Colonial Secretary had adopted after all the cry which had been ringing through the land during the past two years. Ministerialists had denounced the late Government in every possible way for having sanctioned what they declared to be an immoral thing and a great wrong, but they now knew that the way in which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to cure that great wrong was to pay the passage home of a certain number of coolies who wished to go home, and to make some very small alterations in the judicial and punitive measures contained in the amending Ordinance of last year. He though that a perusal of the Blue-book would show that the administration in force at the present moment was working justly and fairly. He considered that the Blue-book proved beyond doubt that, so far from there being any idea of injustice, oppression or slavery, the coolies had ample, fair and easy opportunities of reporting any injustice under which they suffered, and of securing redress for any wrong which might be inflicted upon them. These two things were the only items in regard to which the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister proposed to alter the policy which he had denounced with such vigour and with such invective. Was it worth while to go to all the trouble and expense, to incur all the moral damage, for the sake of such a little result as this? They were aware that hon. Gentleman opposite knew—although perhaps they could hardly expect them to admit it—that the fact that they found themselves on the Ministerial side of the House instead of on the Opposition side was responsible for the change that had come over their attitude. No effort was spared to induce the people of the country to believe that the conditions which the late Government had sanctioned were so degraded and immoral that they cast an almost ineradicable stain upon the honour of our country. Leaflets, placards, and posters were seen everywhere. Hon. Members poisoned the minds of the people, who either had not the time or had not the opportunity to learn the true state of affairs for themselves. Slavery in the literal sense of the word it was not. ["It was."] He heard, at any rate, that there were two hon. Gentlemen there ["200"] who were really so honest as to believe what they said. Was it slavery to engage a man of his own free will in his own country, to take him free of expense to the country in which he had undertaken to serve? Was it slavery to give him the opportunity of returning to his own country at any moment when he so chose? Was it slavery to enter into an obligation to restore him to his own country at the end of his period of service? Slavery meant the taking of a man from his own home against his will. ["No."] Did anybody ever find a slave in the old days freely and voluntarily going into slavery? He believed that there were very few people who really and honestly believed that under the conditions which had been laid down in the Ordinance there was any real element of slavery. Hon. Gentlemen opposite at the election might have used the words metaphorically; but why should they publish pictures of Chinamen in chains, driven under the lash to work which they loathed; why should there be representations of Chinamen in chains parading the streets? There was one fact in the agitation which had to a certain extent been left out of account. It was that, in trying to persuade the country that they took a right and their opponents a wrong view of the matter, their opponents had succeeded not only in persuading their fellow-countrymen of the truth of the charges, but they had succeeded in persuading people who lived in foreign countries that the British Government had made itself responsible for a system which any right-minded man must inevitably condemn. They had succeeded in inducing foreigners to believe that the late Government had cast a dark stain upon the honour of our Empire, and now the Government were showing that, although they had led them to believe that if they came into power they would forever put a stop to this system, they really intended to do nothing. That, he had no doubt, would cause hon. Members opposite small concern. They had never been careful to maintain the high honour of our own country. [Cries of "Withdraw," "Oh," and "Shame."] He had nothing to withdraw, but he would say that he doubted if the course which the right hon. Gentleman had seen fit to pursue would strengthen the hands of the Foreign Secretary in conducting negotiations with foreign countries. Ministerialists had brought charges against the Opposition which had been refuted by the newly published Blue-book; they had been refuted by the evidence of people who knew from their own experience on the spot the real conditions under which the Chinamen laboured. If the Ministerialists were still not satisfied that they had made a mistake, he thought the least the Government could do was to appoint a Royal Commission, which should ascertain and publish beyond any doubt the real facts of the case, so that the people of the country might be able to come to a right judgment upon everything that hon. Gentlemen opposite had said. Such a Royal Commission would be welcomed by Lord Selborne and by the mining managers, upon whose integrity so strong an imputation had being cast, and he hoped that such a tribunal might be appointed to inquire into the whole question upon the spot. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would now admit that he and his friends were mistaken in the views they expressed. That, he thought, was only due to the late Government, whom they had maligned, but above all they owed it to the people of this country whom they had misled.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that this was not the first time he had addressed the House of Commons upon this question, and he understood how difficult it was to speak upon it. He was bound to say that, on the last occasion upon which he addressed the House, those who took an opposite view to himself were, if he could tell their attitude by their speeches, somewhat impressed by the fact that he had lately come back from South Africa, having had some little experience of that country, and having seen the conditions under which the Chinese worked on the Rand. He remembered urging at that time that the word "slavery" was not the proper word to apply to the coolies, work, and he remembered that the hon. Members for Camberwell and the Abercromby Division of Liverpool said "agreed." Therefore, he could only assume that they did not mean to convey the impression they conveyed to the House, but that they agreed that the conditions under which the Chinese lived and worked in the Transvaal were not conditions of slavery. [Major Seely dissented.] At that time he put forward the argument that, in the first place, the Chinese were needed there as the Kaffirs were needed; and that the conditions under which the Chinese worked were not different from those under which the Kaffirs laboured, except that they were to some extent better, inasmuch as their food was better, that their housing was better owing to the fact that new buildings had been put up for their accommodation. The House now required to get back to first principles in this regard, and at the risk of wearying the House he would recall to their recollection, and to the recollection of those who were not present at the last debates on this question, what the conditions in South Africa were which called for this legislation. Everybody who knew South Africa agreed that the basis of all unskilled labour in the Transvaal was black labour. It was not a matter with which any white man had ever had to do; it was not ordained by anyone of mortal birth. A higher Power had ordained in this matter. In Africa below the Zambesi there were six black men to one white. Let them suppose that in Guildford or Reigate, or any town in England, there were six black men to one white, that some citizen wanted a ditch dug, and that the digging of that ditch was open to competition. Would any Labour Member of this House suggest that the white man would enter into competition with the black? White men never had and never would do so. There was no Labour Member in this House nor any Member who knew South Africa who did not know that. There was not a man who went from this country to South Africa, whether he was a skilled or an unskilled worker, who did not refuse to do unskilled work except when driven to desperation, and then they would only do it for as short a time as possible. The whole of the unskilled work had been done in that country by black labour; by the natives of Cape Colony, Natal, the Transvaal, Basutoland, the Orange River Colony, or by imported labour from neighbouring States. Everybody knew that 80 per cent. of the black labour employed in the Transvaal was not native to the Transvaal or even British Africa, but that it came from Portuguese Africa and other sources, and that the interruption of the work at the mines and the interruption of the output was due to the fact that there was insufficient native labour. There was an insufficiency of labour in the time of Kruger, and from time to time appeals were made for permission to import more. At the Bloemfontein Conference it was decided that there was not enough native labour to be had from available sources and that labour must be obtained from others, by which no doubt was meant China or Japan or elsewhere. Then a Royal Commission was appointed, and that Commission published a Majority and a Minority Report. The Majority Report set forth the number of black men who would be required for the mining and other industries and also for agriculture in the country. A curious mistake had occurred with regard to that, which had an indirect bearing upon this particular point. Lord Elgin said in his Despatch to Lord Selborne that a supply of 250,000 labourers would be required for the mines, because the Commission found that 129,000 were required at once and 196,000 would be required five years later. Upon that the Colonial Secretary built up an argument to show how impossible it would be for this Government or any other to admit 250,000 indentured labourers into South Africa.

He noticed that the Despatch had not been answered by Lord Selborne, and he wondered whether it was because Lord Selborne conceived that the question was one which did not show that knowledge which a Colonial Secretary ought to have of the needs of the Transvaal. The Under-Secretary perhaps would enlighten the House upon that. What the mine-owners asked for was for 129,000 labourers at the present time, and during a period of five years 196,000, that was, altogether. At the present time there was still a demand for more labourers. Suppose the Liberal Party had been in power when the needs of the Transvaal had been presented with all the information which the late Government had at its disposal from the Transvaal, would they, he wondered, have taken such a large responsibility as they did now. Would the cry of slavery have been raised then, because he noticed that the cry of slavery was not raised strongly until just before the election, except perhaps by the hon. Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool, who had been consistent in this matter throughout. But that hon. Gentleman was as unsound in his ideas as to slavery as he was sound in his definition of citizenship. The hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that the

Chinaman was an alien and that, therefore, not being a citizen under the British flag, he had a perfect right under the laws of his own country, of which he was still a citizen, to make such bargains as he pleased. There were legal Members of this House who would admit the accuracy of what he said—that the conditions of the contract between the Chinese and the Transvaal Government were such as could properly be made.

It would be possible to make such a contract in this country. As for his definition of slavery, according to Wharton's Law Lexicon, slavery was a state in which one man had absolute power over the life, fortune, and liberty of another. When they laid sentiment aside and gave anything like close attention to what the word "slavery" meant in the English language, the use of the word in connection with these conditions was absolutely unsound, to say the least. It was absolutely unsound, unfair, unjust, and untrue. The cry had produced its result, and the result was seen in this House. He hoped hon. Members were satisfied. He believed, however, the time would come when they would look back upon the election, and the means by which it was won, with regret. He hoped so. He had too much confidence in the common-sense of his fellow-citizens, and of his fellow-Members of this House, to doubt that. He did not blame the British working-man for having believed the tissue of falsehoods which had been disseminated throughout the country, which had taught him to think as he had thought, to turn the late Government out of office, and to put the present Government in. He did not blame him. Candidates who fought the late election had the same means of information, but some did not use those means of information as they should have used them, and it was upon their heads that the future judgment of this country would fall. As his hon. friend who moved the Resolution had said, the Liberal Party had won its position by a general condemnation of the clauses of the Chinese Ordinance, and out of that general condemnation had come one or two little things which amounted to this: that the Ordinance might continue until the Transvaal was able to pronounce judgment upon it for itself. But it seemed to him that that was only shifting the responsibility, and that it was only leaving to the Transvaal what the public of this country believed would be a responsibility borne by this Government. They who thought they were right in permitting the Chinese to be imported into the Transvaal would have no fear regarding the judgment which would be passed by the Transvaal. From first to last the people of the Transvaal had been practically united upon its necessity. There was, a few weeks ago, a statement in the public Press that an immense meeting of miners had been held in the Transvaal to protest against Chinese labour. But other resolutions had also been passed by other bodies. The paper from which he had cut the illustration he now showed the House was a paper which he thought all would respect, namely, the *Daily Graphic*. It was a picture taken of that vast assemblage of miners—between 300 and 400 people. But there were on the Rand 18,000 white skilled workers, and those 18,000 white skilled workers were there by virtue of the fact that there was a sufficient supply of black and yellow labour to give them work to do. He hoped hon. Members would recognise the fact that this country did not always demand that the raw material for the hands of British skilled workmen should come from white labour alone. If they were to establish that principle he wondered where Lancashire would be. He wondered where all the sugar refineries, the rubber manufactories, and a hundred other manufactories in this country would be if this country had to depend solely upon white labour for the raw material of the skilled white workmen in this country. The mines of South Africa gave the whites skilled work by virtue of the raw material got by unskilled labour. These views were once held to some extent by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies. They owed him no grudge, but he wondered why it was the hon. Gentleman had changed his views so completely during the last few years regarding the Transvaal and the attitude this country ought to take up towards the Chinese question. He did not blame him for changing his mind. They once had the honour of thinking alike, but the hon. Gentleman had travelled faster than he had, or had retreated, perhaps, faster. At Grosvenor House in July, 1903, Mr. Churchill said—

> "We are not living in South Africa; we are not the people of South Africa; we are not entitled to dictate to South Africa what arrangements she is to make in regard to the labour she employs. We don't wish to rule South Africa as we do a Crown colony. I am all for countries minding their own business. It would be very undesirable to interfere with the condition of labour in South Africa, and I think myself it would be equally undesirable if the Colonies were to press us to alter our economic conditions at home. . . . Of this I am quite sure that supplies of labour will have to be obtained from the natives of the country or from Indian or Chinese sources if ever the mining industry is to be completely rehabilitated, and if ever South Africa is to turn her back on the dark shadows of the past and march steadily and firmly towards the rising day."

*MR. CHURCHILL: Has the hon. Gentleman got the whole of the speech? Will he read what follows that?

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I have not the whole speech with me, but this has been quoted again and again. I think my right hon. friend the Member for Dover has the whole speech here, and will probably give the House the advantage of it.

*MR. CHURCHILL: It is the fact that the passage has been quoted again and again, but an important omission has always been made in what follows after the words just quoted. I said "Provided the conditions are humane, and provided that South Africa consents."

SIR GILBERT PARKER: The hon. Gentleman knows I have no desire to misrepresent him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do it then?

SIR GILBERT PARKER: My statement was perfectly accurate, "Provided the conditions were humane and provided South Africa consents." But surely the hon. Member meant the Transvaal?

*MR. CHURCHILL: No, South Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he supposed then if Natal and Cape Colony and Rhodesia and the Orange River Colony and the whole of South Africa met in a Conference of their representatives, as they did meet, and there said that there was not sufficient native labour to be got, and that they must go to outside sources for it, then the hon. Gentleman would consider that the whole of South Africa consented. If it came to that, the Dutch in South Africa had committed themselves to Chinese labour. They themselves passed, while in power, two Resolutions in favour of the importation of Chinese labour, and the reason why they did not carry them out was the expense. He submitted to the hon. Gentleman that he had placed himself in a considerable difficulty, but he only wished to say to him that if the advocates of Chinese labour thought no differently from what they did when he (the Under-Secretary for the Colonies) thought as they did, why should they be blamed now for consistently holding to their opinions and for having consistently fought for what they believed was the good of South Africa? As for the charges that had been made against the Chinese and against the conditions under which they worked, the whole Blue-book was a refutation of anything like violence or maltreatment of the Chinese. Undoubtedly the Blue-book did show that sanction was given to illegal flogging. He did not think there was any Member on the Opposition side of the House who, had he known flogging was going on in the mines, would not have been in favour of abolishing it. Flogging in itself, however, was not slavery, else what had been pursued in the British Navy and public schools was slavery. There could not be a case of slavery upon that basis. The treatment by individual managers or overseers of individual Chinamen by flogging was a matter which the late British Government and the Transvaal Government did not directly control, because a certain amount of option was given to the Chinese superintendent. It had been done away with. The amended Ordinance issued at the end of last year was an Ordinance the terms of which, as it seemed to him, no Member of the House could object to. If they admitted at all that the Chinamen were to come in, that that was a question by itself, but if they admitted at all that the Chinamen were to come in there must be those natural restrictions with which the natives were surrounded. They should not be allowed to wander abroad and affect the social conditions of the country. The evidence of the Blue-books was sufficient to convince him that the importation of Chinese had had no ill effect upon the social condition of the Transvaal. The conditions under which the Chinese were working at present were as favourable and fair as those under which the Kaffirs worked, and yet the Party opposite had never raised any objection as far as the Kaffirs were concerned. They had heard no protests against the employment of Kaffir labour in the mines of Kimberley. He wished to remind the House that their Convention with China concerning the importation of Chinese into British dominions was made by a Radical Government, with Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone as some of its members. Chinese had been working in English dependencies ever since without protest from any member of the Liberal Party so far as their public utterances were concerned The Prime Minister admitted that, if Chinese were imported, compounds and conditions of restraint were necessary, and that took away from hon. Gentlemen opposite one of their strongest arguments. To the credit of the Liberal Party be it said, that up to three months before the election they did not use literature which was disgraceful, but there appeared certain articles in a paper in London with photographs representing Chinamen undergoing torture, and although they had been absolutely refuted, those pictures and posters practically won the election. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Those posters were based upon articles written by Mr. Frank Boland and Mr. Pless, who had a Chinaman strung up in his room all night, and the next morning he had a photograph taken which he intended for a book to expose the slavery on the Rand. It was upon Mr. Frank Boland's statements in the *Morning Leader* that those cartoons and the slavery campaign were built, and they all proved to be untrue. [An HON. MEMBER: "Not all of them. Lord Selborne said that a portion of them were true!"] Lord Selborne said that before June of last year there was flogging; but he did not defend flogging, nor did Lord Selborne. It would have been far better to have had no flogging at all, but it had been removed. He wished to point out, however, that it was not upon flogging that these posters were built, for they depicted Chinese with chains around their necks and manacles on their hands. The Prime Minister had stated in a letter that he would not be a party to slavery in any form under the British flag, but the right hon. Gentleman did not say that the Chinese Ordinance was slavery, although hon. Gentlemen opposite drew that inference from the Prime Minister's statements. A combination of things of this kind had gone far to place the Opposition in the position in which they found themselves to-day. They had much to fight for, and they had much to defend, and plenty of time to defend it, but that would never prevent them from raising their voices against what they believed to be an unfair agitation upon a question important to the welfare, not only of this country, but also of one of our Colonies. The Liberal Party were now in power, and they had long been out of power, and he hoped that power would give to all the members of the Liberal Party a new conception of their duties towards the Colonies. ("Why?") He had never said that the Liberal Party lacked an appreciation of the Colonies, but their position was one which the Colonies themselves could not understand, because when things which were nearest and dearest to them were put forward, they were not received with cordiality, to say the least of it. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] It was so in South Africa to-day. At a meeting of the Progressive Association in Johannesburg not long ago, Mr. James Leonard said they had been calumniated upon every platform and upon every hoarding, at every by-election and every election during the general election, and now that the battle had been won those calumnies were repudiated by the central organisation of the Liberal Party. He ventured to say that those words represented the views of 99 per cent. of the British citizens in South Africa. [Cries of "No."] They also represented the views of many of our Dutch fellow citizens, who were anxious for the development of their country. He hoped the Government would take good care to see that they did nothing in regard to the present labour conditions of the Transvaal which would bring to bankrupty and ruin not the Transvaal alone, but the whole of that country—Cape Colony, Natal, and the Orange River Colony—which lived by virtue of that one industry. If by any act of this Government Chinese labour were taken away in an attempt to give white unskilled work to the Transvaal, if the Ordinance were seriously altered in a way which would prevent the development of mining in the Transvaal, they would be doing an act which would be treachery to the Empire itself. The present Government could not afford to do that. He did not know whether the Government would listen to an appeal from him for a Royal Commission of Inquiry. Mr. Leonard had pleaded for an inquiry. Lord Selborne also asked for a Royal Commission in the interest of British justice. If the late Government were to be condemned for bringing Chinese labour into the Transvaal he asked that there should be established a court and jury which would try them. They should not be condemned on *ex parte* statements in the Press and in this House. If the Royal Commission brought back the report that slavery existed and that every man who had visited the mines of the Transvaal was wrong, then the Members of the Opposition would take their punishment. [AN HON. MEMBER: "You have got it."] No, they were punished without being tried. They were punished by the misuse or lack of use of evidence. He appealed to the Prime Minister and those who sat beside him to do themselves and the Party to which they belonged the justice of granting a Royal Commission to inquire into the circumstances which hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House had defended, and then to abide, as the Opposition would loyally abide, by the judgment of that Commission.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end."—(*Mr. H. W. Forster*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): There is very little to complain of in the tone of the two speeches to which we have listened, though I think I must make exception in respect of one remark which fell from the hon. Member for Sevenoaks. I think it extremely undesirable that comparisons should be drawn between the conditions of Chinese labour in South Africa, and the conditions under which British soldiers serve the Crown, and I am surprised that the hon. Gentleman, who not so long ago was associated with one of the great services in this country, should have been led into a comparison of what is, after all, to put it at its best, the lowest form of labour hitherto tolerated in modern times under the Union Jack with the most honourable service a private man can render the Crown. I have one observation to make in regard to the Amendment and the tenor of the speeches. The Party opposite, or rather the Party who sit in that corner of the House opposite, have taken up a clear position on the subject of Chinese labour. They are its authors, its admirers and its champions, they believe with all the sincerity of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that it is necessary for the welfare of South Africa, and that without it the British Empire would collapse. Yet I think the tendency of their Amendment and speeches, and certainly the tendency of some remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham the other day is to urge His Majesty's Government on to courses more extreme than those upon which they are resolved and to precipitate the very catastrophe which the right hon. Gentleman professes himself so anxious to avoid. Do not let us judge this too harshly. We have been in Opposition ourselves and we know very well that the Opposition is always seeking for opportunities to embarrass the Government, not always successfully seeking, and we know very well that an Opposition is bound in regular custom to oppose and to criticise the Government, and has no real measure of responsibility for anything it may say or do. I will only venture to congratulate the great Imperial Statesmen who sit upon that bench upon the ease and celerity with which they have exchanged the responsibilities of office for the irresponsibilities of Opposition. I must confess that I listened with very great pleasure the other day to the speech of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in which he so strongly condemned anything in the nature of electioneering misrepresentation. I am sure we all agree that every effort should be made to raise the standard of our electioneering contests and to keep out of them any aspersions upon the humanity, the loyalty, or the patriotism of the candidates who may be engaged in them. The Prime Minister will welcome the co-operation of the right hon. Gentleman in anything that may tend to raise the standard of our Party life, and I can assure him that his departure upon so praiseworthy and new a course will be watched with sympathy and respect in all quarters of the House I took occasion during the elections to say, and I repeat it now, that the conditions of the Transvaal Ordinance under which Chinese labour is now being carried on do not, in my opinion, constitute a state of slavery. A labour contract into which men enter voluntarily for a limited and for a brief period, under which they are paid wages which they consider adequate, under which they are not bought or sold and from which they can obtain relief—I shall have to say a word about that later —on payment of £17 10s., the cost of their passage, may not be a desirable contract, may not be a healthy or proper contract, but it cannot in the opinion of His Majesty's Government be classified as slavery in the extreme acceptance of the word without some risk of terminological inexactitude. If Chinese labour be not described as slavery the right hon. Gentleman should not readily assume that it is for that reason a proper contract. I have often heard it said that it is a contract not less proper than that permitted under the British Guiana and Trinidad Ordinance which was introduced by Lord Ripon, the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords. I am amazed to find that persons who have had the advantage of access to official information commit themselves to and persist in a statement so woefully inaccurate. My hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool stated to the House the other day that there were no less than five points in which the Transvaal Labour Ordinance differed from the Guiana Ordinance, and in every case differed for the worse. He showed that under the Chinese Ordinance a labourer contracts himself out of the right to hold real estate, and out of the right to dwell in the country after the termination of his contract. He contracts himself out of the right to dispose of his movements in his spare time, and of the right to rise by any skill which he may have to any more lucrative and satisfactory terms of employment. He contracts himself into the liability to be arrested without warrant, and he did suffer from the disability of not being tried in open Court. Now, I do not say that any one of these conditions in which the Transvaal Ordinance differs from the Guiana Ordinance is necessarily indefensible in itself; but, taking them all together, as they should be taken, cumulatively and collectively, they undoubtedly constitute a notable and melancholy derogation from any standard of Labour Ordinance, even the lowest hitherto tolerated within the British Empire. I hope that that is a statement of the case which commands the support of my hon. friend the Member for the Abercromby division, than whom no one has been more active in drawing public attention to this question, or deserves in greater measure the gratitude of this House.

Let me say at the outset that no responsibility for this system rests upon His Majesty's Government. We are not concerned to defend it, or to justify it. It was passed in spite of our votes and in spite of our protests. We have nothing to conceal, nothing to palliate, nothing to deny. The whole burden of this subject, whether it be a cause of glory, or of discredit, rests, and can only rest, upon the Conservative and Protectionist Party. We, the present Government, are the heirs to their evil inheritance; but we are doing the very best we can to undo the harm which has been done. We ask the support and confidence of the House, not in reference to matters which we could not deal with from the beginning, but in regard to measures that are projected. We ask for confidence and approbation for what we do ourselves, upon our own responsibility, and upon our own initiative. I am sorry on general grounds that Mr. Lyttelton is not here, although I am very glad, from another point of view, that we have a very worthy representative of the constituency of Leamington. I am sorry that Mr.

Lyttelton is not here, just as I am sorry that Lord Hugh Cecil is not in his old place. I am sure that every one—that is to say every one who is not unduly apprehensive of a sharp tongue—would wish that statesmen and politicians who have taken a considerable part in the affairs of this House, and whose actions must be criticised and brought under severe review, should be in their place, and should have some opportunity of defending themselves. In the absence of the right hon. Gentleman I cannot easily find words to characterise as I should have desired that great and cardinal error of which Mr. Lyttelton was guilty in sanctioning, in the first instance, the policy of the Transvaal Labour Ordinance. He had no mandate from South Africa. No plebiscite was taken, and I myself remember that a very distinguished and wealthy gentleman connected with the mining industry admitted to me that it would have been a very good thing to have had a plebiscite. He said—

> "We were perfectly willing to have a plebiscite, but the difficulty was that it would have gone the other way."

[OPPOSITION cries of "Name."] It would not be fair to mention a private person's name.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is evidence of its value.

*MR. CHURCHILL: You can judge of its value as it stands. The pretext that the Legislative Council in South Africa could give any authority—a nominated council of gentlemen who owed their position and existence to the will, even to the caprice, of the Secretary of State—the pretence that such a council could relieve the Government of any responsibility, or could speak in the smallest degree with the authority of South Africa, was among the sorry farces which we were forced to witness in the closing days of 1904–5. I say, that to subject a Colony still in a state of tutelage to this sordid experiment; to introduce a new and sinister element into the racial complications in South Africa; to flout the opinion of all the self-governing Colonies to whom such passionate appeals had been addressed; to degrade the *status* of labour all over the world; and to do this without the slenderest authority from the people of the Colony concerned, and in defiance of every section of disinterested public opinion in Europe, was a reckless and wrongful act, an iniquity for which the Party opposite have suffered and richly deserved to suffer. It was characteristic of the late Administration that they plunged into this far-reaching and momentous experiment without any clear idea of how far they meant to carry it. No stopping-place was defined, and no limit to the number of Chinese to be introduced was fixed. In the first instance we were told that the number of Chinamen was to be limited to 10,000; a little later we had 55,000 as the utmost limit of those who would be required; and quite recently, just before the Government changed, all sorts of arguments and assertions were put forward to show the desirability, I think, of importing something like 150,000 Chinese into South Africa, and maintaining them on that great scale until the gold mines were worked out. By October, 1904, there were 20,000 Chinese in South Africa, and by October, 1905, they had increased to 47,000. On the 27th of October the late Colonial Secretary telegraphed to South Africa an inquiry whether the time had not come when the mine owners should agree voluntarily to limit the importation of Chinese labourers to the Rand. Between November 12th and 18th last applications were made for no less than 16,199 new licences, and on November 18th 13,199 were granted and signed, and 3,000 were signed but not delivered. On the 24th November the expectant nation was informed through the columns of *The Times* and the *Daily Telegraph* that the Ministry was about to resign. It would almost seem from these figures as if the Rand had had even earlier information, and that it was feared the new Government would stop all further issues of licences. That, of course, was regarded as a foregone conclusion. Everything alike indicated that that would be the earliest exercise of the newly acquired Executive power. I think it was one of Lord Elgin's first acts to inquire how many new licences were outstanding. No answer had come to Mr. Lyttelton's telegram, and there seemed every reason to believe that the number outstanding would be very small indeed. It was therefore with some surprise that my noble friend learned that no fewer than 16,000 licenses, or three, four, or five times as many as had been applied for in any other month had been granted in the fortnight preceding the change of Government! The question whether to revoke these licences or not was anxiously considered by the Cabinet. The Law Officers, here and in South Africa, expressed the opinion that these licences could not be revoked without an open breach of equity, or an arbitrary suspension of the law. However these licences may have been obtained, and whatever we may think of it, the word of the Crown had been passed, and the warrants to import the labourers had been issued on the authority of the British Government; and on the faith of these warrants money had been spent. It is quite true that the Crown cannot be sued for damages, but His Majesty's Government are bound by the laws which they administer. They are not above the law. Furthermore His Majesty's Government will not fall below the ordinary accepted standard of common equity. It was therefore quite clear that the licences could not have been revoked without admitting large and indefinite claims for compensation from British funds. The Cabinet consequently decided that the 13,199 licences which had been issued must stand, and they decided, furthermore, that no just ground existed for differentiating between these licences and 3,000 licences which had been granted, but which had not been formally delivered.

So much for the past. Let me turn to the future. Here, I think, I shall carry the right hon. Member for West Birmingham with me when I say that it is not very easy to retrace a wrong step in politics. One of the strongest arguments against a system of protective duties is that once they have been imposed, once the industry of the country has adapted itself to them, it is almost impossible to remove them. Those who were with us in the last Parliament know that in the case of the remission of agricultural rates, of which every Member of the Liberal Party disapproved, that once that provision was passed into law and the counties were receiving the grants, it was found that the pressure was such that it was impossible to repeal the Act. That is true of any improper dole or grant which may be obtained by any interest in this country from the Government of this country. Once an improper or unjust contract has received the sanction of law it becomes the basis on which all manner of perfectly healthy and unobjectionable agreements are founded. Bargain is added to bargain, plan is built on plan, and a whole economic structure rises, tier above tier, upon the faulty foundation. If in erecting some great building it is found that a girder in the lowest story is defective, the building becomes a cause of peril and danger to the public, but it is not possible immediately to withdraw it. To wrench it away would be to involve the certainty of ruin; but to whom? The jerry-builder might have decamped. The contractor might have made a fortune from the job and retired. It is upon the humble occupants that the miseries of the downfall would descend. It is my duty to lay before the House all the facts and materials of this grave matter, and I cannot but doubt that the sudden and arbitrary deportation of a third of the labour supply of South Africa would produce an utter economic collapse. We need not waste our sympathy upon the Rand magnates. Whatever we may do or whatever may take place in South Africa, many of them will still retain as many millions as the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil would consider it desirable that any individual should enjoy. But to thousands of small people, to honest investors, to shopkeepers and tradespeople in Johannesburg, to British miners and Boer farmers, to railway servants on South African railways, to hard-working colonists and others, there might come, if any violent or immediate action were taken and 60,000 coolies were deported, the harsh and unexpected pinch of poverty and suffering. The progress of Colonies struggling feebly forward out of the agony of the war would be rudely thrown back; the finances of every State in South Africa would be embarrassed, the whole course of South African trade would be dislocated, and something very like famine on a considerable scale might ensue in Johannesburg, and the great mining district connected with it. If such a catastrophe resulted from our action, however benevolent our intention was, however benevolently right in principle that action might be, we could not escape the most grievous responsibilty; and let me remind the House that when this country incurs a grievous responsibility the discharge of that responsibility takes the form of a serious financial payment. It is not beyond the resources of engineering to remove the defective girder by means of levers and other mechanical appliances. The lever which His Majesty's Government desire to use to carry out their policy and to bring to an end the present system of indentured labour in the Transvaal, is, first of all, the opinion of the people of the Transvaal. We have good hopes of that opinion. I do not think for a moment that any Parliament in the Transvaal would violently and immediately expel the Chinese, but I most firmly believe that a Parliament fairly elected and representative of all classes and both races in the country will decide against the continuance of this experiment in a permanent form, and will certainly reject the impudent demands—I can call them nothing else—now being put forward vastly to extend its scope. I read in the interesting letters which Mr. Massingham has contributed to the *Daily News*—hon. Members on the other side are perfectly entitled to laugh at that authority, but it is nevertheless an authority which on this side of the House will carry weight—Mr. Massingham shares very closely the views which we hold; and I observe that in those letters he states that if the opinion of the Transvaal is fairly consulted, and a really representative assembly is brought into life, the opinion of that assembly will be, as I have indicated, against the perpetuation of the system. I believe that the maxim: "Trust the people" ought to follow the flag, and a very considerable body of evidence which we have been able to collect, shows that a representative assembly which has never yet been consulted will probably effect a termination of this experiment. I would say also in the second place that the mineowners themselves are beginning to realise that Chinese labour is economically a failure, that it is expensive and uncertain, and exposes them to an amount of criticism and vexation which greatly unsettles their business, and that it is likely to be more expensive, more uncertain, and more liable to expose them to criticism in the future. There is no greater delusion than that low wages mean high profits. No labour is so dear as cheap labour, and the labour which costs nothing is the dearest of all. I am fortified in that paradoxical reflection by the enormous depreciation which I observe to have taken place in the prices of South African stock since this policy was initiated. If only the late Government had had the courage to stand firm and refuse their sanction to this Ordinance, hard and increasing pressure would have enforced the employment of more machinery and more skilled white labour. A telegram has arrived too late to be included in the Blue-book from Lord Selborne in answer to inquiries which we addressed to him on this point. He says—

> "The points you make are of great importance and interest. I have on every possible occasion urged on mine-owners the value of labour-saving appliances, and I have every reason to believe that the mine managers are constantly alive to the urgency of the matter."

We are going to make them more alive. The telegram continues—

> "I have of course, no technical knowledge on that subject; but what I most hope is that labour-saving appliances, where applicable, would at once and at the same time reduce the demand for unskilled coloured labour and maintain the demand for skilled white labour. I will place the subject before the mine-owners without delay."

If the Chinese are gradually withdrawn and no collapse takes place, if by cutting off the possible supply of Chinese labour to South Africa, the whole experiment is forced to "peter out" by the natural process of exhaustion, as that operation is effected that pressure of which I have spoken will revive. The expectation that the unrestricted supply of cheap Celestial labour will never end will be abolished, and in its place will come that more manly alternative, more skilled and educated men, and more perfected mechanical appliances. It is quite true, as has been said by an hon. Member, that the gold mines of the Witswatersrand, although not the only industry in South Africa, are nevertheless the mainspring of its commercial development, and that Johannesburg is the great stage upon which all South African dramas are played out. But Chinese labour is unpopular, and the pro-Chinese party are losing ground steadily in South Africa. If we handle this matter delicately, gently, and patiently they will be beaten at the election, but we must be very careful not to send them reinforcements. If Chinese labour is unpopular in South Africa the interference of this country is also unpopular. I was talking to Mr. Creswell on this subject the other day. ["Oh!"] Hon. Members may say "Oh," but Mr. Creswell is an honest man, and let me say that it takes a good deal of courage for a mining engineer to live in South Africa for two years and fight the great capitalists. I was struck by Mr. Creswell's opinion on this point, and we must take care not to reinforce the dwindling pro-Chinese party by a formidable band of those who would stand up for Colonial autonomy and self-government and who would resent our interference in what they regard as their local affairs. I observe that Mr. Wybergh, who used to be Government Commissioner of Mines, and who owing to his extreme opposition to Chinese labour has terminated his employment with the Chamber of Mines, in a long letter to Mr. Creswell said that it would be extremely inadvisable simply to repeal the Ordinance, as such action would be most resented by those most strongly opposed to the Chinese. The House will see that we have to walk very warily in the matter if we are to attain the ends which we hold most earnestly in view. It has been said that our policy is to leave the decision of this question to a Transvaal Legislature. Broadly speaking that is true, but the statement requires to be much more carefully defined. The hon. Member for Gravesend has embarked on a very long and technical argument showing how necessary is Chinese labour for the prosperity of South Africa. I do not propose to follow that argument, and I advise the House not to be enticed into the technical aspects of this question. Such a discussion would be perfectly endless.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh!

*MR. CHURCHILL: No doubt the right hon. Member for West Birmingham is supplied with masses of highly technical information which he is prepared to use in a highly controversial manner. But I respectfully submit to the House that the question whether Chinese are cheaper than Kaffirs, whether white men and machinery can work the mines at a profit, whether the Chinese are on the whole a law-abiding people or a terror to the countryside, whether the importation of Chinese was in the true interests of the white people in South Africa, whether the product per stamp was less or more and why, whether the big houses discouraged Kaffir labour when they wished to establish a case for Chinese, whether it would really make a difference to South Africa if the mines are worked out in ninety years instead of in forty-five—all these questions are, no doubt, very interesting and important, but they are not the business of the House of Commons. This is not the place to thrash them out with advantage. They are questions that can be fought out in the Transvaal Assembly, and it is there that the material and political issues should be fought out. It is in a Parliament of their own that the people of the Transvaal must make up their minds on social, technical, and economical grounds whether Chinese labour is a good foundation on which to build the permanent welfare of the land in which they live. But there is another set of considerations which, without exciting the derision of the Party opposite, I might perhaps call humanitarian and moral considerations. On those this House is fully competent to pronounce, and is entitled and even bound to pronounce. On these great matters of principle the opinion of the House of Commons must always be expressed as a guide to the practice of other Legislatures all over the Empire. The fact that there will be a greater delay than the Government had anticipated before the Transvaal Assembly can meet together forced these considerations on the Government with irresistible weight. We have been forced to examine the Transvaal Ordinance with searching and attentive eyes. I think the hon. Member who sat down last expressed his entire approval and commendation of the Transvaal Ordinance of 1905. That view cannot be shared by the House.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: The amended Ordinance.

*MR. CHURCHILL: There are certain clauses in the Ordinance of 1905 to which His Majesty's Government cannot consent, and which they have taken steps to remove. Clause 3 says—

> "Whenever a fine has been imposed by the superintendent or inspector under the jurisdiction by this Ordinance conferred, the superintendent or inspector, as the case may be, may notify the fact to the employer of the labourer who has been convicted, and it shall be the duty of such employer, on receiving such notification, to withhold the amount so imposed as a fine from any wages due or to become due to such labourer, and pay it over to the superintendent or inspector for the benefit of the Colonial Treasury."

That section provides that an employer should deduct from the wages of the labourer the amount of the fine to which the labourer has been condemned, and His Majesty's Government cannot approve of that principle. It is a vicious system which might easily lead to the gravest possible abuse. Clause 6 provides that—

> "It shall be the duty of every importer to divide the labourers employed by him on any mine into so many gangs or sections as he may think necessary for the proper conduct of work, and for the maintenance of discipline and good order, and to appoint a labourer hereinafter referred to as a head boy in charge of each gang or section. The name and passport number of each such head boy shall be notified by the importer to the superintendent, and thereupon it shall be the duty of such head boy to report forthwith to the manager of the mine at which he is employed, any offence committed by any labourer in his gang or section, and on failure to do so he shall be guilty of an offence against the said ordinance and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding £5."

That is an attempt, I suppose, to introduce the monitorial system into South Africa, and no doubt it is a reminiscence of the public school days of those who were responsible for this Ordnance. His Majesty's Government have directed that this provision shall be abolished. Sub-section 2 of Section 6 I will not read at length; its object is to assert the principle of collective fines. A gang of labourers accused of any offence may be punished collectively. That is an odious system, that persons should be punished for acts not specifically alleged against them, the truth of which has to be ascertained by process of law. That provision has also been abolished. Sub-section 30, Section 6, says—

> "Any importer refusing to carry out the duty imposed on him by this section, shall be guilty of an offence against the said ordinance, and shall, on conviction, be liable to a penalty of £100 for every day he is in default."

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Why, they will soon be able to pay some of the £30,000,000 back at that rate.

*MR. CHURCHILL: That is to say, if the importer refused to divide his labourers into gangs, and appoint monitors, he would also be liable to punishment. That clause will go with the others. Section 17 provides that any labourer who shall practice any fraud or deception in the performance of any work which he is bound to perform, or who shall wilfully or negligently lose, or throw away, or damage the property of his employer, or who shall use threatening or insulting language towards his employer, or to any one in lawful authority over him, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £5, or to imprisonment not exceeding one month, or to both such fine and such imprisonment. That is to impose criminal punishment for offences which are not of a criminal character, and which happen in the ordinary conduct of a manufacturing establishment. In the opinion of the Government this provision was inadmissible and has been abolished. The Government have also directed that all trials shall in future be held in open Court. None are to be held in the mines, although it is intended to allow a mine inspector who knows Chinese to exercise the functions of a magistrate. That is permitted, as being in the interests of the Chinese labourers. These are the provisions to which most marked objection is taken—provisions indeed "calculated to bring the reputation of this country into contempt." Now let me come to a more serious aspect of the ordinance. We are all agreed that cruelty and illegality must be suppressed whenever discovered. Flogging was bad enough, and I gladly recognise the work accomplished by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in reducing the annual number of lashes administered under the British flag. But here is the flogging without the safeguards of the law. The hon. Member for Sevenoaks said there was no proof of the charges of inhumanity which have been brought.

MR. FORSTER: I said there was no support for the language in which Gentlemen opposite who condemned the conditions of the Chinese work as slavery.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member for South Kerry has been mentioned particularly. I quite admit that Mr. Boland's charges are exaggerated. Very often when a private individual brings charges against a great system they will be exaggerated, but even if a small part of his charges are true, and they are the means of bringing about reforms, he has, in spite of exaggeration, rendered a public service. Lord Selborne says in the Blue-book, page 21—

> "It is not denied, and, indeed, I have already informed you that prior to June 1905 illegal corporal punishment after trial by the mine

authorities was widely resorted to as a disciplinary measure in the mines of the Witwatersrand; and it cannot be disputed that it was administered in the manner described in Mr. Boland's letter, namely, in a manner borrowed from the practice of the Chinese Courts of Justice."

That, in the words of the Amendment, constitutes a state of things calculated to bring the reputation of this country into contempt.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a lie.

*MR. CHURCHILL: Some one says it is a lie. Well, I am reminded by that of the remark of the witty Irishman who said, "There are a terrible lot of lies going about the world, and the worst of it is that half of them are true." It is not enough that the Government should endeavour to put down these illegalities. Of course, it goes without saying that persons guilty of such things would be put down by any Government with all the rigour of the law, but in the vast area over which these mines extend, cases of cruelty might occur without the knowledge of the inspectors, and it is that consideration which has induced His Majesty's Government to take the third important step in their policy as regards the Chinese Labour—I mean what is commonly called repatriation. That is a system by which we hope to undercut cruelty. I do most earnestly urge the House not to underrate the importance of this provision. Its importance is not underrated elsewhere. If anyone will study the fall in prices that I regret to say has followed the declaration of the policy the Government have thought it their duty to carry out, they will see that we are not playing with words in this matter, that it is not a sham fight in which we are engaged, but that, on the contrary, it is ball cartridge that is to be fired. This provision of repatriation comes strictly within the general policy of observing the law, which I say is one of the limitations in which the Government action will be confined. Under Clause 14 it is open to any coolie who tenders £17 10s. to return at once to China.

MR. CROOKS: Out of his bob a day!

*MR. CHURCHILL: My hon. friend has defined the weak point of the provision. The right hon. Member for Croydon seemed to indicate the other day that there was no difference between the effect of the clause in the contract and the proposals of the Government in regard to repatriation, and when he said that, an hon. Member wittily interjected, "Only the expense." That is true. Why, there is no difference between protection and free trade—only the expense. I have had a calculation made to show how long it would take a coolie to save the £17 10s. necessary to pay his passage home. Last year the average wages were 33s. 6d. per month, and during the present year they were 37s. 7d. per month. It takes a long time to save £17 10s. out of that. The cost of extra food or clothes, or the money the coolie might wish to remit to China, must be deducted, and we must also make a deduction for the fines which might be easily imposed on coolies who were known to be intending to leave the mine. How enormous the sum derived from these fines is may be judged. In July, 1905, the amount was £1,844; in August, £1,793; September £2,154; in October £5,200; and in November £3,419.

MR. CROOKS: Why, they will be able to pay the £30,000,000 directly.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I am told that the utmost a coolie could save by the most rigid self-denial would be 20s. a month, in which case it would take him, roughly speaking, eighteen months to earn the amount necessary, and, of course, any accident or illness would delay his power of earning that money; and observe, that the very men who would most want to leave are those least suited to the work, and, as payment is made by piece-work, they are men who would probably earn much below the average wages. Altogether it is not untrue to say that the average time it would take a Chinaman to earn the money necessary for his repatriation under the Lyttelton Ordinance would be between eighteen months and two years, and if he did not make up his mind as to whether he wished to leave until he had been in the Transvaal six months, he would be brought to within six months of the expiry of his contract before he could avail himself of the clause. That shows how farcical and nugatory is this provision, which looks so elegant on paper. But our system which has been introduced by the Prime Minister and Lord Elgin operates almost immediately. No doubt a short period of notice would be required in order to make sure that the labourer was sincere in his desire to return home, but if a Chinaman expresses the desire to return for any good reason, or without giving any reason at all, his right will be sustained by the forces of the Crown, and the funds to return him to his country will be provided from the British Exchequer. I cannot but think that this decision, to secure which Lord Elgin has exerted himself, will carry relief to many hearts throughout this country. [Some OPPOSITION laughter.] You may laugh, but I had the good fortune to address as many meetings in the country as anyone, and I know there was no subject which caused greater and more genuine sorrow among the people than the belief that Chinamen were being kept in the mines against their will by forces of armed constabulary, and were hurled back to their compounds when they tried to escape. Many of them went to South Africa in the belief that they could pursue their own handicrafts in a rich land—an Eldorado; but instead they found themselves compelled to do nothing but drill so many inches of rock at the bottom of a deep level mine, and I say the spectacle of the Chinaman wandering over the veldt, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him, with half the world between him and his home in China—I say that spectacle is as degrading, hideous, and pathetic as any this civilised and Christian nation has made itself responsible for in modern years. At any rate, that spectacle is gone, and gone for ever. The Chinese are free to be free. If they are kept in South Africa by compulsion it shall in future be compulsion on the voluntary system, and if they consider these conditions unpleasant they will be mitigated by the operation of a conscience clause. If they are ill-treated, unhappy, or brought to South Africa by misrepresentations, the way is open, the field is clear, and the door has been unbarred. So long as His Majesty's Government are forced, through no fault of their own, to administer this Ordinance, no man will be held to such a contract as the Ordinance embodies unless of his own will.

I must say one word more to complete the circle of this argument. The steps which the Government have taken remove all danger of cruelty, of impropriety, or of gross infringement of liberty. I believe they remove the practical objections which have been urged against the Ordinance, but they do not, of course, remove our fundamental objections in principle to this system of labour. In these days, with every important nation of the globe in communication, and brought closer together, with Asiatic labour fluid as it never was fluid before, I think it is necessary to state the clear principle by which we should be guided so far as possible in the future. What is the cause of the innate and instinctive aversion which is maintained by this Parliament and the country to the system of Chinese indentured labour? It is that underlying that system there is the idea that men are to be treated as if they were implements. Are the Chinese necessary to Africa, to the development of the gold mines, to the fertilisation of its fields? Is it really true, as those who sit opposite say, that their co-operation is necessary for the prosperity of the country? Is it true that without their co-operation, collapse, stagnation, and bankruptcy must ensue? Does your great business really depend upon the laborious industry of these strangers? Is your empire to be maintained, are your fortunes to be amassed by the day to day consumption of their vital energies? Then, at least, receive them with that gratitude and respect which you owe to persons having it in their power to render such indispensable and inestimable services. Is it not an unworthy thing to accept wealth and security at their hands, and at the same time to shrink from the contamination of their touch? I lay down this principle in this democratic Parliament, that no man should be imported into a country as a labourer unless you also accept him as a human being. A great matter of principle like this affects not only the particular colony chiefly concerned, but it affects the working of our whole colonial system. That system can only rest upon the basis of self-government—or Home Rule, whichever name you prefer. Home Rule implies within broad limits the right to govern or misgovern, manage or mismanage, for good or for ill, the community upon which it is conferred. No one can watch the unceasing flow of business transacted through the Colonial Office without seeing that many things are being done, by persons to whom the Government has been forced to give wide discretionary powers, of which the people at home would not approve. Laws which are hard and narrow are being applied in certain British dominions. There are instances of the treatment of native races and the infliction of punishments and penalties which do not commend themselves to the sense of this House or the people of England. We have got in some cases to put up with those things, but there is no reason why we should cease to keep over South Africa the same regulating control that we do over other great self-governing colonies like Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. I believe that, generally speaking, given free institutions on a fair basis, the best side of men's nature will in the end surely come uppermost.

But this doctrine has its limits. Honestly, I do not believe that the Transvaal Parliament, fairly elected on a reasonable basis, will decide in favour of the retention of the Chinese. I think they will bring the experiment gradually, but surely, to an end. But while believing that, it would be unreasonable not to face the other alternative, however remote the contingency of it may be. What if the colony should decide to continue the importation of Chinese? I must point out that while the responsibility of the Imperial Government would be lessened, our objections to the present conditions under which Chinese labour is carried on will not be removed by any vote of the Transvaal Assembly, however unanimous, however representative. Nor should we be altogether without our remedy, quite apart from the power always reserved to the Crown. Anyone who knows the Acts and Conventions under which this system of Chinese labour is obtained and maintained will see how vital Imperial co-operation is and how fatal Imperial opposition would be. In Lord Elgin's original telegram he expressly says:—

"While reserving their opinion and form of action in the whole matter His Majesty's Government," etc.

Those are words to which a real and serious significance should be attached. It should not be taken for granted for one moment that while the conditions of Chinese labour continue to be repugnant to the opinions and feelings of the people of this country, Imperial sanction for the extension and maintenance of such a system would be forthcoming. This is the policy of the Government. For this policy I invite and claim the confidence and support of the House of Commons. It is a policy of integrity, a policy earnest, yet not violent, a policy which, without being impatient in its beginnings, will in the end prove very sure.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover): The Under-Secretary for the Colonies has had a hard task to perform this afternoon, but he has discharged it with vast ability and great courage amidst the deepening silence of his supporters below the gangway. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] His speech has had to be a versatile speech. He began by saying that Chinese Labour is not slavery, and he went on to show that its undesirable characteristics can be removed by altering the regulations and fines, and by helping the labourers with a fare. That is very different to the advice tendered at the recent election. The Under-Secretary has, in fact, boxed the compass of every view expressed before the election and since the election. But what of his followers in this House, who, until he rose, have declared that Chinese labour is "slavery?" [Cries of "It is."] The Government do not take that view now.

MR. CROOKS: We do, all the same.

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member for Woolwich had waited and allowed me to put my case he would have heard that I was about to point out that there were many in this House who said it was slavery and who still adhered to that opinion.

MR. DALZIEL: We do now.

MR. WYNDHAM: If you do, then why does not your Government whom you support stop this thing? The Under-Secretary has girded at Unionists for trying to drive the Government on to an extreme course, yet that course is the one which the majority of their supporters have, during the election, said must be taken. In their opinion it is slavery, but in ours it is not. We were not ashamed of defending the steps which had been taken to develop South Africa, but you ought to be ashamed of it if you believe what your followers have said, and what some of your colleagues in the Government said at the last election. When the late Ministry were in office we used to hear a great deal about the "collective responsibility of the Cabinet." I should like to measure the collective responsibility which combines the President of the Local Government Board and the Secretary for Education, who, in spite of their election pronouncements, sit in happy unison with those members of the Government whose mouth-piece the Under-Secretary has been this afternoon. Throughout the country Chinese labour has been called "slavery." The electors were asked to "vote for so-and-so and no slavery." [Cries of "And they did."] That is an important admission, because it has been said by some Ministers that the country voted for free trade, and last night it was claimed the election had been fought on Home Rule. Now, it appears the country has given a mandate for no Chinese labour. The Under-Secretary has had to fight a rearguard action this afternoon, and it seems that the whole of the general staff of the great Liberal army has bolted and left the army on the field to shift for itself.

The Under-Secretary for the Colonies, before he came to the great policy with which he concluded his speech, declared that the whole responsibility for Chinese labour rested apparently upon the Opposition. The responsibility did rest upon my right hon. friends when they were the Government, but that responsibility now rests on His Majesty's present advisers. And how do they propose to discharge that responsibility? I think we can guage their sense of that responsibility when I remind the House that the Under-Secretary proceeded immediately, not to explain the policy of His Majesty's present advisers, but to make an attack upon Mr. Lyttelton. He seemed to have forgotten for the moment that he was now on the Treasury Bench and therefore was no longer called upon to criticise members of the last Government. This charge of slavery in the country became mere descriptive reporting, and according to the Under-Secretary it was not a good example of exact terminology. We have been held up to odium throughout the country. Why? According to the Under-Secretary for the Colonies it was because Chinese labour is not a wholly desirable form of contract. At one time he said it was the least desirable form of contract, but he abandoned absolutely the whole charge of slavery which has so often been preferred.

*MR. CHURCHILL: My whole point is that it is an improper contract.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is the point which is now made by the Minister who has to meet this Amendment, but it was not the point made in the country by his followers. They believed Chinese labour to be slavery. We do not believe it, and when we were in office we were prepared to defend it. You tell us that you do not believe it, and you seek for a middle course. There is no middle course open to you. You have either to withdraw and apologise for the charge or you have to prove it, and the only way in which you can prove that you do indeed believe it is by stopping the use of Chinese labour in South Africa. The Under-Secretary for about the third time in his speech told us that he would turn to the future. I hoped to hear this precious policy expounded, this middle course, but we had instead a long disquisition on the philosophy of building with a pretty imagery about a girder. The charge made against your countrymen by your supporters is that they have been guilty of moral obliquity. Well, you must alter your image founded upon the building trade. It will not do to take the jerry-builder. If anybody in building a house offends against the law, that house is shut up. [Cries of "No."] But the policy of the Government is not to shut up the house according to this metaphor, but to enter it and carry on the business themselves. The Under-Secretary says, and we agree with him, that if they took the course of deporting these Chinese labourers, the whole of South African trade would be dislocated and that there would be a famine in Johannesburg. I need not elaborate that argument. I was surprised to hear it from the exponent of the Government policy. Did it not occur to hon. Members, who have been so ready in the country to bring these accusations against their fellow-subjects, that these considerations might also weigh upon the people in the Colony? Did they not believe that we believed this labour to be necessary to the whole social structure of life in South Africa?

MR. CROOKS: Dividends I always thought it was.

MR. WYNDHAM: If Ministers shared the ideas of their followers they would see no difficulty in this matter, but they see a difficulty, and they see that you cannot deport the Chinese labourers from South Africa without provoking an immediate catastrophe in that country. Then the hon. Member explained his intellectual position, and I am bound to say that I could not quite follow all that was contained in that enigmatic phrase. They are to apply three remedies in South Africa. The first is that they are to give advice to the people in that country, to send out models of labour-saving machines, and to try to teach them how to conduct their own business, and if, as he puts it, they handle the matter delicately enough, they have very good hopes that they will persuade the party in South Africa with whom they agree to vote there in the manner in which they desire. What a heroic remedy for a national stain! But they do not stop there, although I thought it pretty cool for the Under-Secretary to arrogate to his Party all humanitarian considerations when all the elections were conducted on very different lines at home. A little advice to the electors of South Africa is all for the present that is going to be done, because I cannot take very seriously those Amendments now proposed in the second Ordinance of 1905. They may be all admirable, I dare say they are; as described by the hon. Member they appeared to elicit assent from many parts of the House. By all means do away with any abuses in the fining system. But does that alter what your followers called slavery? It is trifling with the House and the country and your own supporters to pretend for one moment that you can meet our Amendment by an argument of that kind. But let me argue fairly. You are going to pay the fares back in the case of any labourer who can prove to the satisfaction of a number of persons that he is dissatisfied with South Africa and really desires to go home. But that is proposed in the face of the information in your own Blue-book that more than 1,900 of these labourers have been repatriated at their own expense, and that 1,500 of them are trying to get back to South Africa. The Under-Secretary has, with all his ability, quite misconceived the purport of the Amendment. It is not enough for the spokesman of the Government to get up and explain alterations made in the conditions of Chinese Labour, and to state that excellent advice will be tendered to the electors in South Africa. You have got to justify that libel, or, if you cannot justify it, you have to withdraw it and to apologise for it. We do not approach this matter from a Party point of view. From a Party point of view I should say that you were only liable to the charge of eccentricity. It was eccentric on your part to anticipate for your own election a subject which was to be shortly referred to an election in South Africa, while at the same time you postponed the date of that election.

But from a national point of view we have a deeper ground of quarrel—the quarrel of every man who has voted for us in this country, and of every man who has defended the use of Chinese labour in South Africa. If you persist in making this charge without proving it you are committing a greater wrong. If you persist in your Party debates in stating that Chinese labour is a form of slavery, while at the same time you could have a better form of contract, and yet postpone the election in South Africa, that is an outrage on decency and will alienate the sympathy of every man, whether Boer or Briton, in South Africa. Moreover, if you pursue this course you will deserve the contempt of your own followers. The Under-Secretary expressed the pious hope that South African opinion would decide against the employment of indentured Chinese labour. Why should he think that? You have got to prove that Mr. Quin, who led the Opposition to Chinese labour, but who afterwards assented to it, was in favour of slavery, or that he condoned it for the sake of a quiet life. You have got to prove that any number of men in South Africa are in favour of slavery. Your own Blue-book contains evidence to the contrary. The right hon. Member for Morpeth made a speech in this House in which he said that while in South Africa nearly all the people he met were in favour of Chinese labour. [AN HON. MEMBER on the Labour Benches: He said the very opposite.] I am not criticising the opinions of the right hon. Member for Morpeth on Chinese labour, but that right hon. Member said that he had met a number of people in South Africa who were in favour of Chinese labour. If you persist in your charge without proof your opinion amounts to a condonation of slavery in South Africa. Then what are we to say of the Free Churches in South Africa? I could quote letter after letter written by ministers of the Free Churches there begging their co-religionists in this country not to impute to them the horrible charge which you are not afraid to prefer against them and against so many of your fellow countrymen. Attempts have been made to justify that charge by creating prejudices. Recently, attention has been almost exclusively directed to alleged flogging and torture in the mines on the Rand. No one would condemn in this House with deeper feeling than I would any use of flogging in the mines in South Africa; but these charges are being made to create a prejudice, and you have got to prove them. In the body of the Blue-book there is evidence, which I accept, to show that those charges, as originally made, were grossly exaggerated and inaccurate in the majority of cases, though not in all. But how did the Blue-book begin? It began with flaming journalistic headlines:—"The price of gold;" "Flogging of the Rand yellow serf;" "Horrible cruelties;" "Barbarities practised in the mine compounds;" "Terror on the Rand;" "Measures for preserving life and property." I think if the Under-Secretary and those who acted with him desired to secure a cool and practical consideration of this matter they should not have begun this Blue-book with such flaming headlines. Flogging or any form of torture has always been illegal under the Ordinances for which the late Government were responsible. I concede that the law was in some cases broken, but, if we are to believe the evidence in the Blue-book, no such infractions of the law have occurred since June last. Is that denied? Then came the *Morning Leader* in September with these flaming headlines, and they appeared first in the Blue-book, whereas the evidence that these practices had been discontinued in June was buried where nobody but an ardent student could find it.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The documents in the Blue-book are printed in chronological order, which is the invariable practice.

MR. WYNDHAM: After the general searching inquiries instituted by Lord Selborne and Mr. Lyttelton, there is no shirking the demand by Lord Selborne that a Commission should be sent out, if the Home Government are not satisfied that all these evils, if they ever existed, have come to an end. Then we have, in the order of time, Lord Elgin trying to persuade the mine owners that they will not want so much labour as they think they require. Then we have, the postponement of the election which will decide the issue, and, failing that, the declaration of the Prime Minister about the impossibility of interfering in this delicate matter—how the delicacy has increased since the raw assertion of atrocities which stained the honour of the British flag were made! Then comes the printing of these accounts, which are now admitted to be exaggerated. We are told that slavery existed before, because the Chinaman paid his own fare back to China, and that slavery ceases now, and all evil features are eliminated from the system, because the Government in certain cases are prepared to take that charge upon themselves. During the course of the Under-Secretary's speech, I noticed that in this matter, which he claimed to be one of humanity and morality, he twice advanced the argument to his supporters that it would cost a great deal of money to bring this system to an end. If a tenth or a hundredth part of what has been said in the country had been true no price would have been too dear to repurchase the country's honour. It is because those who constitute the Treasury Bench do not believe what their followers believe that they are prepared to think of economy and the Exchequer.

But supposing this is not slavery and they are content to continue it, they have libelled their countrymen here and libelled their countrymen in South Africa. The Government abolish some forms of summary jurisdiction, but do not do so entirely. They alter the scale of fines, and say that a fine is not to be imposed in certain cases. They do not abolish summary jurisdiction, because possibly they think it may be the better plan not to do so. This amending Ordinance was drawn up upon the responsibility of the Attorney-General of the Transvaal, and the chief law officer of the country is far more likely to know what regulations are best calculated to give effect to the object to be attained than any man in this country. I do not think anyone will accuse us of a desire that any Chinese labourer should be subjected to injustice. I remember when these Ordinances were being discussed how insistent with all sincerity were the humanitarians that all the policemen should be fellow countrymen of the Chinese. If they have read the Blue-book they will find that the Chinese policemen have their Chinese ways, which we cannot tolerate. An attack has been made upon the reputation of this country, and that attack has been believed in foreign countries. You cannot meet that attack, or justify that libel, by such paltry expedients as those with which the Under-Secretary concluded his speech. The proposal to pay the passage back of those who wish to leave South Africa does not justify the libel, and it ought to be withdrawn. If it is true, the only course is to put an end to this employment of Chinese labour. The Under-Secretary says he has put an end to it. How? By leaving it to be decided by a general election which is to be postponed, by advising the electors to handle the matter delicately, and by the help of a somewhat shadowy threat. The South African nation know their own business, but if they claim the right to employ this labour, which every self-governing colony would have the right to do, the hon. Gentleman held out a threat that the Government would make diplomtic difficulties with the Court of Pekin. A more contemptible policy after the charges which have been preferred has never been presented in this House. Suppose that you succeed in that policy, are you sure that South Africa will always insist upon Chinese labourers being repatriated. I believe that you are drifting towards a great danger and a great disaster in South Africa. Supposing that under this system you get rid of Chinese labour, if the revenue falls do you not think that people will not follow the course which was followed in the Western States of America, and have the Chinese back without the conditions now imposed? I put this in all seriousness to the Prime Minister. If you get rid of Chinese labour for a time in consequence of this action and the country suffers, will the colonists love you for that? May they not have the Chinese back without the condition of repatriation, and without the conditions framed by Lord Milner and Mr. Lyttelton to prevent any breaches of humanity. Instead of supervised ships Chinese coolies will come in ocean tramps. There will be no Imperial control in the compound. The Government will then have lost the regard of our British fellow subjects in South Africa, and the respect of our Boer fellow subjects, and posterity will say once more "was all South Africa worth so many tears?"

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that before proceeding to graver matters he would like to say that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had unintentionally misquoted the right hon. Member for Morpeth. What the right hon. Member for Morpeth stated in this House was that when he visited the Transvaal he attended many of the workmen's trade union meetings, but he could not find any workman who was in favour of the introduction of Chinese labour.

MR. WYNDHAM said he would accept the correction so far as it related to any speech made in the House, but the speech to which he referred was made outside the House.

MAJOR SEELY said he did not rise to put the matter right, but rather to say that he would be glad if the Government could make a little plainer the words used by the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies. The Government stood on an impregnable rock, as it seemed to him, when they said that hon. Members opposite who introduced Chinese labour could not lay any blame on them with regard to the precise time in which these men, brought over under improper conditions, should be got rid of. No one would suggest that the whole 50,000 should be shipped off in a week, but, on the other hand, twenty years would be too long a time for their repatriation. The essential thing for the honour of this country was that the last indentured Chinese coolie should be taken out of the Transvaal without undue delay. If he understood the Government aright, and especially the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, to whose eloquent speech the House had listened with pleasure, that was absolutely secure, but in order that there might be no mistake he would call attention to the words used. The hon. Gentleman said—

> "With reference to the question as to whether we shall or shall not leave this matter to the Transvaal to decide"

—and that was the crux of the question—

> "we will refuse to, so far as we can control it, and we will forbid the colony to re-introduce a state of slavery."

What was left to the colony was the re-introduction of free labour and not a system of servile labour. The hon. Gentleman said that their objection to that system would not be removed. Imperial sanction and assistance would not be forthcoming, and if Imperial sanction and assistance were not forthcoming it followed that such a system could not be re-imposed. When he heard those words he believed the end of Chinese labour under this pitiful system of indenture was settled for ever, and that being so there was an end, so far as he was concerned, of the matter. He trusted and hoped the Government would not permit re-enlistment, by which these men might be kept there for six years. But even that might be permitted if the words to which he had called attention meant what he understood them to mean. He might be permitted to point out a further reason why the right hon. Gentleman could not be fairly accused of inconsistency in this matter. The right hon. Member was perhaps not aware that the prerogative of the Crown applied to all legislation which was repugnant to the laws of England, and that all colonial enactments were submitted to scrutiny to determine whether they contained any provision which interfered with the exercise of any prerogative of the Crown, or was repugnant to the law of England. These were admitted by His Majesty's Government to be provisions repugnant to the law of England.

MR. WYNDHAM said that could hardly be said after the speech of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies. He had not for a moment contended that they were repugnant to the law.

MAJOR SEELY respectfully submitted that they were. He had again and again referred to the report of the highest legal authority that they were repugnant, and he had never been able to get any contradiction from any authority on the other side of the House, and he did not suppose that the right hon. Gentleman would deny that such contracts as those were repugnant to the law, and that they could not possibly be enforced in this country. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman's contention fell to the ground, and such contracts as these must be disallowed if ever they were re-enacted. How they came to pass was a matter which might well be inquired into, for undoubtedly the spirit, and, he believed, the letter, of the constitution had been violated. There were many ways in which this matter could be made plainer. A provision could be put in the Transvaal Constitution stating that no contract or apprenticeship partaking of the nature of slavery would be permitted. A more specific statement of that kind might also be made—as in the case of many self-governing Colonies, in the instructions issued to the Governors of the Cape and South Australia at the time of their constitution, and subsequently—as to the legislation which could not be permitted under any circumstances. If the Government were considering this matter they might look into this precedent, for they would find that certain things were stated to be contrary to the spirit of the English law, and must therefore receive the veto of the Governor. It would be more satisfactory to some Members if they could have an undertaking that the statement made should be amplified by proclamation, or by a more definite and emphatic statement on the floor of the House, or by inserting some such provision as he had suggested in the constitution of the Transvaal. It was not a matter which could be delayed, but was one which pressed for solution. If it were once fairly and emphatically stated that their motto throughout the British Empire with regard to alien labour should be "free, or not at all," Chinese indentured labour would come at once to an end, because no mining magnate would care to import any more Chinese on such conditions, the need for repatriation would immediately become less, and all the restrictions and various instructions which might cause some dissent in South Africa would become unnecessary. The country had expressed an emphatic verdict, which it was not likely they would ever revoke, and, therefore, if the matter were plainly stated, he believed that there would be reason to rejoice and that His Majesty's Government would find more unanimous support in this matter even than they had at this moment.

*LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he desired to say a few words in support of the Amendment. He, and he was sure the rest of the House, listened with the greatest admiration to the eloquent speech made by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, but he could not help feeling that a large part of that speech was not directed towards the true issue raised by the Amendment. The Under-Secretary was at pains to prove that there was much that was objectionable in the Ordinance which had been under discussion, but the question raised by the Amendment was not that at all. The question was whether the accusations that had been made throughout the country about the effect of that Ordinance were justifiable, and, if they were, how could the Government excuse their conduct in not instantly withdrawing the Ordinance, and repatriating the Chinese. In one respect he ventured to claim some degree of impartiality in considering this question, because in his constituency he had not to meet the question of Chinese labour to any extent. He did not know whether it was thought by his opponents that the neighbourhood of Harley Street and Portland Place was not a favourable ground in which to sow their seeds of misrepresentation, or whether he was fortunate in having a most scrupulous opponent, but where the question was raised at all, it was raised more as a matter of cheap labour than as one of slavery. He observed that, in the debates that had already taken place in the House on this subject, the aspect of the question which depended upon the objection felt by certain members of the working classes to the competition of cheap labour had not been put very prominently forward, and the reason, of course, was very easy to see. He thought that with the publication of the Blue-book it was impossible to maintain that the importation of Chinese in South Africa competed with the white labour in any degree. If it competed with any labour at all, it was with the labour of the black natives. The real charge that had been made throughout the country, and which they on the Opposition benches very bitterly resented, was the charge that the late Government was guilty of introducing slavery into South Africa. The Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool was at pains on a previous occasion to describe what he considered to be the notes of slavery, and he quoted with great approval from—he would not say the words—but the opinions of a legal text-book. He did not know whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman was forced to consult legal text-writers, as some of them were, but he could not help thinking that, if he were, he would not have quite so high an opinion of their value. He said that because the very instance the hon. and gallant Member gave of that text-writer appeared to him to be a very typical fallacy. The very first note of slavery he suggested was that under the Ordinance the Chinese labourer was precluded from holding or enjoying property. He did not know whether it had occurred to the hon. and gallant Member that prior to 1870 every married woman in this country was in that position. Was that a mark of slavery?

MAJOR SEELY: But that does not exclude my argument.

*LORD R. CECIL thought every hon. Member would be surprised to hear that prior to 1870 their wives were slaves.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: And they are still slaves.

*LORD R. CECIL said that many slaves had the right of holding property. But all that was really by the way, because the charge was that they as a Party had been guilty of introducing slavery into South Africa, and it was not a charge that they had introduced a mere technical description of slavery at all. They had been charged with introducing what he might describe as the mediæval and the melodramic type of slavery. It was manacled, tortured, and chained slaves that were implied, and it was therefore irrelevant to tell them to examine closely this Ordinance. The real charge was that they had introduced slavery in the ordinary and popular sense of the term. He did not deny for a moment that several right hon. and hon. Members opposite who sat on the Treasury Bench were more moderate in their charges. He thought he was right in saying that the Prime Minister described the conditions of Chinese labour as servile labour, and of course that was a much more moderate expression than those which they had to meet. But even these moderate expressions must all be taken with the context in which they were used and the circumstances under which they were employed, and therefore hon. Members opposite could not now say that they were free from the guilt of having charged the Unionist Party with introducing Chinese slavery because they only used those moderate terms. The real test of what was charged was what was understood, and the only way they could get at the meaning of language was by seeing what the people to whom it was used understood by it. No impartial person could doubt that the charges of slavery made were understood by those who heard them to have the ordinary popular meaning of slavery. He would give the House an example of his meaning from the celebrated case of the cartoon. What happened? At first there was issued an unauthorised cartoon, with the Chinaman manacled and bound, and being driven from the compound to the mine by the whips of the slave drivers. Its sister cartoons portrayed them being hung by the arms and other forms of torture, and then followed a semi-authorised cartoon, not issued by the official organisation of the Liberal Party, but by an organisation which was in some way connected with it. [Cries of "No; not at all!"] At any rate it was used very largely by the candidates connected with the Liberal Party. In this cartoon a little change was made, for the manacles were struck off; although the labourers were still bound they were not exactly manacled, and the same attitude was preserved. Then came the official cartoon, and although the manacles had disappeared and the Chinaman was not bound, the same attitude was again preserved, and the general arrangement of the cartoon was preserved, and it could not be doubted that it was intended to convey precisely the same meaning as the original unauthorised cartoon. It was simply a more moderate way of conveying the same accusation, for there was no qualification and no warning addressed to the audience. They were not told, "We do not mean slavery in the sense of the other cartoon," for nothing of the kind was said. They felt very bitterly on the Opposition side of the House that this kind of tactics was not fair fighting, and they felt also that matters had been made worse by the belated repudiation and withdrawal made by some of the official chiefs of the Liberal Party. While the elections were in progress no public withdrawal or repudiation was made of these cartoons, but as soon as a political advantage had been definitely secured the repudiation appeared, and they felt very strongly that that was not the way in which elections should be conducted. Some reference was made by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies to the election of 1900. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Hon. Members opposite cheered that, but they would remember how loudly they complained because they were accused of being pro-Boers and not loyal to their country. After that experience hon. Members opposite ought to have been more careful what they said. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] As far as he was concerned, he said that, whether such a method of controversy was right or wrong, it was highly injudicious. These kinds of charges excited passionate resentment in the breasts of those against whom they were made, and sooner or later a reaction came and the people of this country would decline to listen to any charge of the kind; and just as they did in connection with the war, so they would in future decline to listen to any such charge in connection with Chinese slavery. He ventured to appeal even at this moment to the underlying fairness which he believed existed in the breasts of every British partisan, however bitter, to condemn this gross misuse of electioneering weapons, and he asked them to consider whether what they had done in this matter with such a light heart to secure a transient majority would not in the end tend to the destruction of their Party.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [22nd February] to Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end.' "—(*Mr. H. W. Forster*).

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate resumed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I am sorry I was not in my place when the hon. Member for Sevenoaks animadverted on my unfitness for the post of Minister of Education, on the ground, I presume, for I have heard it alleged before, that during the last general election I made myself the purveyor of slanderous statements on the important question of Chinese labour. If that charge were in any sense true, nobody in this House would be more thoroughly ashamed of himself than I; but it is not true, and I think I shall be able to prove that there is no truth whatever in the statement. I was until very lately the chairman of what is called the Liberal Publication Department, and in that character I became and was responsible for whatever the department circulated during the ten or eleven years that I occupied the post. I fully admit my responsibility. But I am not the author of any political leaflet, and very much doubt whether I could write one; the infirmities of my style would probably render that impossible. But as this accusation has been made, I should like to call attention to the sole output of the Liberal Publication Department on this question of Chinese labour. It consists of five leaflets and one picture. The leaflets are of a very simple character. The first begins by asking the following question—

"Are the Chinese in the Transvaal freemen or serfs?"

There could be no objection to that question. It then quoted the Bishop of Birmingham, and afterwards the Bishop of Hereford and the Archbishop of Canterbury. I think that even a Minister of Education in a Radical Government may quote from bishops and archbishops without exposing himself to the charge of being a purveyor of scandalous literature. Then Lord Milner was quoted—

"They come for labour and they can remain for nothing else."

and Mr. Seddon—

"Our fair fame has been tarnished, and we should not be a party to what was semi-slavery."

The Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Percival), said in the House of Lords—

"Veil it as you will you have in this Ordinance the essence of slavery. It partakes of slavery. The conditions are servile, and you cannot get away from it."

Lord Stanmore (lately Governor of several Colonies) said in the same debate—

"I shall very likely be charged with rhetorical exaggeration in having said that the period of the indentured labourers' stay in the Colony would be one of perpetual imprisonment, but that is no rhetorical exaggeration."

The pamphlet proceeds—

"The Archbishop of Canterbury said in the House of Lords—

'I felt that, if, indeed, the necessity be real, it is one of the most regrettable necessities that have ever arisen in our Colonial history—that it should be found necessary, under the British flag and under Christian civilisation, to arrange for the importation of labour where conditions are laid down that labourers imported shall not be permitted to utilise any exceptional powers they may have, or fulfil the desire to rise above the conditions of the merest drudges, doing the lowest kind of work, whatever their qualifications for some higher kind of labour may be.'—*March 4th*, 1904.

"Nearly all the above speakers are political supporters of the Government.

"The truth is that the mine-owners, who control Transvaal affairs, do not believe in liberty. One of them, Mr. Lionel Phillips (a partner in Messrs. Wernher, Beit, & Co., and now Tory candidate for North Paddington) said in a letter to *The Times* (Februrary 23rd, 1903)—

'Liberty of the subject is a fetish. But is it? Englishmen do not think so.'"

That is the first pamphlet.

The second asks—

"Are the Chinese serfs intended to keep British workmen out of South Africa?

"Ask Lord Milner. He said—'We do not want a white proletariat in this country.'—(*June 2nd*, 1903.)

"Ask the Transvaal mine-owners themselves. This is what they say—

"Mr. C. D. Rudd—

'Could Mr. Kidd replace the 200,000 native workers by 100,000 unskilled whites, they would simply hold the country in the hollow of their hands, and without any disparagement to the British labourer, I must say that I prefer to see the more intellectual section of the community at the helm.'

"Mr. Tarbutt (Chairman of the Village Main Reef Company)—

'With reference to your trial of white labour for surface work on the mines, I have consulted the Consolidated Goldfields people, and one of our directors has consulted Messrs. Wernher, Beit, & Co. (two of the largest of the gold-mining companies), and the feeling seems to be one of fear that if a large number of white men are employed on the Rand in the position of labourers, the same troubles will arise as are now prevalent in the Australian Colonies, namely, that the combination of the labouring classes will become so strong as to be able more or less to dictate, not only on questions of wages, but also on political questions by the power of their votes when a Representative Government is established.'"

Then follow quotations from Mr. Hellman, general manager of the East Rand Proprietary Mines, Mr. Schumacher, the Editor of the *Johannesburg Star*, and the Committee of the Johannesburg Engineers. They say—

"If our policy is pursued there should be no opening for discontent among the working classes, no opening for the trail of the serpent—the formation of labour unions."

The third pamphlet begins with a quotation from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, at Leeds on December 16th, 1903—

"We are not going to allow the foreign workman, unless he be of a very desirable description, to take the bread out of the mouth of the British workman."

Then come the quotations we had before from Mr. Rudd and Mr. Tarbutt. Then follows the statement which is perfectly accurate—

"That is the real reason for shutting out British labour. If the gold-fields of Australia and America, where natural difficulties are greater than on the Rand, can be worked by white labour, why cannot those of the Transvaal be?

"Instead, they are now importing thousands of cheap Chinese. And in order to try to overcome some of the objections of the people of the Transvaal to mixing with them, these Chinese labourers are to be kept almost as slaves.

"They are not to be allowed to live anywhere except on the premises of their employer. They may never leave those premises except with a ticket-of-leave from their employer (which he can, of course, refuse to give) and in any case they may not be out for more than forty-eight hours.

"If one of them escapes he may be arrested without a warrant und sentenced to imprisonment.

"Anyone who 'harbours or conceals' an escaped labourer is also to be fined or imprisoned.

"And all this under the British flag, which we have always boasted, waved only over free men.

"The Tory Government has humbly done what the mine-owners wished. It has passed a law to allow this atrocious scheme to be carried out. The Tory majority in the House of Commons has consented to it.

"But what do you think of what Mr. Seddon calls a system of "semi-slavery'?"

The fourth reproduces a Tory cartoon. It depicts John Bull, addressing a trader, a farmer, and a skilled workman, and he says—

"No, the Chinamen is only to do unskilled work in the mines, and he knows it. He can't and won't sneak your business, Mr. Trader, and he can't buy the land that you want, Mr. Farmer, and he can't get your job, Mr. Skilled Workman.

"Tell all your friends to come out now—the unskilled labour problem is settled."

The only comment we make upon that is the following letter which Mr.

Lyttelton, then Colonial Secretary, directed to be sent to a correspondent—

"Colonial Office, S.W.,
September 5th, 1904.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 2nd inst., I am desired by Mr. Lyttelton to inform you—

(1) That he understands that there has been a considerable diminution in the number of cases of beri-beri among the Chinese in South Africa.

(2) That information as to the prospects of immigrants to South Africa may be obtained from the Emigrants' Information Office, 31, Broadway, Westminster, but that Mr. Lyttelton would certainly not advise anyone to go out without a definite prospect of employment.

Your obedient servant,
(*Signed*) E. MARSH."

"That is to say, Mr. Lyttelton warned all workmen against going out to South Africa.

'So much for Tory 'truth'!"

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: And which has just been repudiated by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies.

MR. BIRRELL: The Liberal Publication Department could have no cognisance of what the Under-Secretary for the Colonies was going to say a long time afterwards. I might say that in that Department we have what I doubt not is a unique collection of all the Tory pamphlets and cartoons that were published during the khaki election. I should be very sorry to defend myself by pleading that bad example. But I assert that these five leaflets are honest, straightforward, and perfecty justifiable, and their language is neither violent, extravagant, nor exaggerated. Then there was one picture, about which the right hon. Gentleman opposite and I have already had a little controversy. This artistic production was issued, in the first place, long before any Chinamen had arrived on the Rand. It was not a picture describing any state of things which had existed on the Rand. It was simply a picture suggested by the fact that the late Government had consented to a law permitting Chinamen to be imported into the Transvaal, there to work in the mines under conditions described by Mr. Seddon as semi-slavery. It depicts John Bull, or some person, asleep in his chair, and a weird and ghostly form is pointing to three Chinamen [OPPOSITION Cries of "Oh"]—well perhaps there are four Chinamen—proceeding in a melancholy *cortége* to their work. There is no suggestion of manacles upon them. I am not the artist, and I am bound to say that, until recently, I never saw the thing at all. I therefore bring what the noble Lord opposite has called an impartial mind to bear on the picture, and I assert most confidently that there is no suggestion of manacles. The picture was issued before the Chinamen had reached the Rand, and therefore before there could be any suggestion that they were wearing manacles at all, and it is in my opinion, a perfectly fair picture. These five leaflets and this single picture were the sole output of the Liberal Publication Department. And I do not hesitate to say that both leaflets and picture are fair controversy, and cannot justify any Member of the House accusing me of having in any way, in my capacity as Chairman of that Department, departed from the traditions and canons of fair controversy. The pamphlets speak for themselves, and so do the pictures. They are marked by that moderation which never was the characteristic of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. The country, I do not doubt, hate Chinese labour. I hate it. The country is ashamed of Chinese labour, and I am ashamed of it. Unfortunately the Government has to deal with that state of things. "The evil that men do lives after them, the good is often interred with their bones," although I do not think that those who dig in the grave of the late Administration will find much good there. The Government has dealt with this state of things courageously and usefully—no further importation allowed; repatriation permitted; amendments in the Ordinance approved of and ordered—significant, grave, and I doubt not, effective language that goes to show that these labour conditions are objectionable to the English Government and to the British people, and that they can not, and will not, be approved of in time to come under any circumstances whatever. The whole purpose of this debate is not to do any good to the Chinaman; it is not in any way to alleviate his condition; but it is to put it to the country that we are hypocrites unless forthwith all the Chinamen now indentured are deported and sent home. That is an issue I am quite content to leave to the common sense of the country.

*SIR EDWARD CLARKE (City of London) said he had not intended to intervene in this debate, nor did he ask the House to listen to him in the discussion of the general question of the employment of Chinese labour. But there was a personal aspect of this question which interested all who sat in this House—the question whether there had been fair and honourable treatment dealt out in the constituencies to the Party to which he had the honour to belong. He had been long exiled from the House, and he came back to find that the Party to which he belonged was lying under a stigma more shameful than any that had been thrown on an English political Party for a century past. [AN HON. MEMBER: It is true.] He knew that the stigma was undeserved, and that the attack was made upon men who were as jealous for the honour of our people as any of their assailants on the other side of the House. He had not been attacked in his own constituency in regard to Chinese labour, but he had seen these shameful placards in many other constituencies; and he felt indignant, because they had been designed and intended for the purpose of holding a great political Party up to the execration of the people. And what sort of a defence had they from the right hon. Gentleman opposite? He would not get up, and no Minister either in that House or the other House would now get up, and say that this was a system of slavery. It had been explicitly disavowed in another place, it had been implicitly disavowed in this House; and, though there was an echo from the back benches which repeated the calumnies that had been stated during the late election, there was not a Minister on the Treasury Bench who would get up and say, in the face of the House of Commons, that this was a system of slavery. It was delightful to see the right hon. Gentleman protecting himself behind Bishops and Archbishops.

MR. BIRRELL: Do you object to them?

*SIR EDWARD CLARKE said he was only glad to see indications that his right hon. friend would come under their sway and fatherly and improving counsel. He took quotations from the very advanced Prime Minister of Australia and then reprinted them. It was perfectly fair to reprint quotations from anybody. It was the chief object of the manager of a publications department to do so when his opponents had been guilty of exaggerations. But in the fifth of these pamphlets the word "slavery" was used. When it was challenged the Under-Secretary for the Colonies disavowed the expression "slavery" on behalf of the Government, and then the President of the Board of Education said—

> "How could I foresee what the Under-Secretary for the Colonies would say?"

MR. BIRRELL: I said—

> "How could the writer of the pamphlet foresee?"

*SIR EDWARD CLARKE said he was not concerned to distinguish between the writer of the pamphlet and the man who used that writing for political purposes. It was not a question of who made the coin but who uttered it, and at the time of the election this pamphlet was put out by the official organisation of the Liberal Party. Was his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education justified in saying that he could not foresee what the Under-Secretary for the Colonies would say? His right hon. friend ought to have foreseen that, when the turmoil of the election was over, and these misrepresentations had gained the allegiance of constituencies not well instructed, they would be shown to be absolutely hollow and without foundation. As to the famous cartoon depicting a row of Chinamen on the Rand, he would with confidence put it into the hands of any man and ask whether it was fair and reasonable to describe it as depicting men proceeding to their work "in a pensive and melancholy attitude." He was quite content to leave that picture and the comment to the judgment of the country. [AN HON MEMBER: You have had it.] Yes, they had it at a time when these things were believed to be true. Now that they were known to be gross partisan misrepresentation it was easy enough to say with a tone of cheerful contentment "You have had it." In 1880 he himself gained the vote of a great constituency, which introduced him to public life. Some six weeks later he was rejected by that same constituency, and that was due in great measure because of placards published all over the borough of Southwark, in which there was a representation of a soldier at the triangles being flogged till the blood ran down his back.

*MR. CHURCHILL : With the full concurrence of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham.

*SIR EDWARD CLARKE said the Under-Secretary for the Colonies was not quite justified in that interruption, which has nothing to do with the matter. He had never been in the House when there was a debate on flogging in the Army, and had given no vote on the subject at all. While all must earnestly desire to keep elections free from extravagant exaggerations, they would also feel that those who had been sufferers under this latest and worst form of misrepresentation should take the earliest opportunity of protesting that there was no foundation for the slanders, and by that process endeavour to make it possible that hereafter those abominable things should be avoided.

*MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury) said he was sure the House was glad to hear again the voice of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the City of London who had been absent from the House for some time. They would all agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman in wishing for a better tone in our political controversies. He might have had some sympathy with the Members of another great Party five or six years ago when they were subjected to very gross misrepresentation, and on whom a most disgraceful stigma was placed. He was sure, too, that the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone would not regret that his first speech in this House was in favour of the amenties of public life. He had described the wounds inflicted on his feelings by what he considered unjust accusations, and wondered that hon. Members had not learned better. But was it not possible that some of the exaggeration of which he complained was learned in the sad year 1900. There were others in this House against whom most abominable cartoons were issued. One Member who was actually at the time in South Africa visiting the grave of his son was depicted in a cartoon as pulling down the British Flag and trampling it under foot. Nothing that had been said in this controversy had approached in his opinion the dastardly attacks made on Liberals during the Boer War. What was said by the noble Lord with regard to slavery rather disposed of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Gravesend who gave an extreme definition. The noble Lord pointed out that Roman slaves might hold property and were sometimes rich men. The hon. Member for Gravesend said it was not slavery unless the man was in the absolute power of another with respect to life, liberty and property.

SIR GILBERT PARKER : What I said was that the definition of slavery given by my hon. friend the Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool was not the definition given in the law lexicons which I quoted.

*MR. TOULMIN : And did not the hon. Gentleman adopt the definition he quoted? The hon. Member adopted the definition that it was not slavery unless there was absolute power over life, property and liberty. He himself thought that a man who was flogged without due process of law was a slave. In the vulgar tongue the condition of Chinese labour in South Africa was slavery. Personally, he did not use the word "slavery" in the election. He found a mere repetition of the facts was sufficient. They must all have been gratified with the concluding words of the Minister for Education that there would be a time when the system of Chinese labour would come to an end. On the Ministerial side of the House they were taunted with not instantly putting an end to this system. There were several questions on which they must decide before they could come to a correct decision as to what their action at the present moment ought to be. There was the question of the servile condition of this service, the treatment of the coolies, and the great racial problem of their being introduced into South Africa. The question of servile labour was an Imperial and not a local question, and they could not settle it unless they took into consideration what was thought of it by the other great Colonies. Personally, he should like one of the questions submitted to the next Colonial Conference to be the future *status* of labour under the Imperial flag. That would not be an unworthy subject to discuss at that Conference. On the question of the treatment of the men, the enlightened selfishness of the mineowners would guard the men against intentional cruelty. But the system was cruel, and bred cruelty. It was suggested on the other side that the Chinese should be bundled back in a body. If the conditions of Chinese labour were so good as described, why deprive the coolies of the advantages they had in wages, which were so much higher than they could get at home? Lord Selborne, in his Despatch of January 20th last said—

> "The sudden withdrawal of a certain proportion of the trade of the country would, as I hold, in the end lead to the reduction of the general business prosperity by the same pro portion, though this reduced condition would only be reached through a cruel period of collapse and stagnation of the whole business organisation."

When they were warned in that manner by Lord Selborne how could they wonder that the Ministry was most cautious in the methods they adopted to put an end to this system? The deportation of the Chinese at once would mean a policy of panic. It was once said of a famous action, "Magnificent, but not war," and in like manner it might be said that such a policy would be magnificent, but it would not be peace. He denied that the mineowners of the Transvaal had ever the right to ask for special conditions to be made for them for labour. He would say that the system by which the gold was being taken from the Transvaal at present was the worst the ingenuity of man could devise for developing South Africa. It was a system by which Berlin, Paris, and London were interested and not the Transvaal. It was to build palaces in Park Lane, and not farms in a free colony. There was in the Blue-book just published some justification of the charges which had been made as to the treatment of the Chinese and natives. Lord Selborne's Despatch of December 9th to the Colonial Secretary contained an admission of the use of illegal corporal punishment, which had been already read to the House. There was also a statement which showed that the coolies were chained in prison—

> The statements made in Mr. Boland's letter as to the use of a horizontal beam in the lock-up of the Witwatersrand mine, are also, as you will observe, refuted in the general manager's and Chinese compound manager's reports. The reason why such a beam is placed in the lock-up is, to my mind, satisfactorily explained. If the ringleaders in a riot between coolies were placed in the lock-up, prior to trial, without being fastened to a beam to keep them apart from each other, further fighting and probably bloodshed would ensue."

What were the coolies "fastened to a beam" with? It would not be packthread. The resources of civilisation in the mines did not go further than chaining men at different sides of a room, instead of having two rooms to prevent their further quarrelling. Then the punishment of the cangue was admitted by Lord Selborne—

> "Mr. Mackarness's letter (to the *Westminster Gazette*) is accompanied by a reproduction of a photograph of a Chinese coolie being punished by being made to wear what in China is termed the 'cangue.' I absolutely condemn its use, which is clearly illegal, but, as in the case of flogging, I am quite satisfied that this form of punishment has been wholly discontinued since June last."

As to the character of these labourers there was a significant letter from one of the mine managers in which he said—

> "Among the Chinese employed on the mine there are between 200 and 300 hardened criminals, many of them being assassins, who boast of the number of murders they have committed; these fellows require careful watching, as they are constantly in possession of dangerous weapons, as knives, dynamite, etc.; only a week or two ago some coolies exploded a charge of dynamite, luckily a light charge, under Messrs. Ginsberg's store and destroyed a portion of the building. It must be admitted that strong measures are necessary in dealing with such fellows."

Who introduced these very undesirable aliens? He believed that if the mineowners had given fair wages, and good treatment, and had had patience there would have been a sufficient number of black labourers provided. Many of the speakers in this debate had spoken as if hon. Members on the Government side of the House wished to deprive the whole of the blacks of their right to labour. He had never heard of any of his hon. friends who took up that position. They recognised that the blacks had as much right to labour in that country as the whites. The records showed that an increasing number of blacks were being employed. He hoped the Government would go on in the prudent way in which they had attacked this problem. It had been left in a way which would tax all their prudence, but personally he had every trust that they would remove immediately the servile taint which was associated with the employment of Chinese in South Africa.

*MR. HOUSTON (Liverpool, West Toxteth) said he would have much preferred to move the Amendment to the Address of which he had given notice on this subject, because it raised a plain issue and was free from ambiguity. He was very interested by the speech of the Prime Minister a few nights ago. He was pleased to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that during the recent election he did not indulge in the use of any of the mural literature of which they complained in regard to Chinese labour, but he omitted to mention that he had no contest in the Stirling Burghs. The right hon. Gentleman also informed the House that throughout Scotland that same practice was adopted. He thought it reflected great credit on gentlemen born north of the Tweed that they were economical in this as in other matters. He would point out that the right hon. Gentleman was Prime Minister not only for Scotland but for England as well.—[An HON. MEMBER: And Ireland]—and if he did not know what was going on in England he ought to have done so. He would endeavour to enlighten him on that point. The speech of the Under-Secretary was a brilliant coruscation, but it was a plethora of platitudes. That speech contained one or two points of importance. The hon. Member said he did not consider this was a matter of slavery. The right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education spoke of the "repulsive lies" issued during the Khaki election. He would beg to remind him of one issued during that election, "the smoking hecatombs of slaughtered babes," of which he was the author.

The Prime Minister ought to be aware that on nearly every Ministerial and Labour platform in the country Chinese slavery was spoken of in no measured terms and in the most extravagant language. It was characterised as slavery introduced into South Africa at the behest and in the self-interest of a group of German Jew-millionaire mine-owners, the privileged and pampered protégés of a corrupt Conservative Government. [An HON. MEMBER on the LABOUR benches: That is exactly the position.] The walls of nearly every constituency in the kingdom were decorated with pictorial and highly coloured posters illustrating the abject and servile condition of these wretched Chinese labourers. In his own division of Liverpool, where he had to fight one of the most intelligent and advanced of the Labour candidates, a man who was up-to-date in the matter of advertisements, a procession was introduced through the streets. That procession consisted of abject creatures dressed as Chinese coolies, with pig-tails and all, chained together by the neck, and under the control of a task-master with a lash. This procession was followed by a funeral hearse, with his own coffin inside, and an inscription on a placard "Sexton tolls Houston's knell." But he had not done it yet. [An HON. MEMBER: Next time.] No; he would not do it next time. Following the hearse was a crowd of "Unemployed British workmen" carrying banners on which was inscribed "This was what we fought for in South Africa." Serious Radical newspapers which had never hitherto condescended to indulge in illustrations had pictures of the atrocities of Chinese slavery on the Rand, together with letters from South Africa. Eloquent speakers appeared on every platform and described the condition of these wretched creatures who had been taken from their native homes, and, after a long and tedious voyage, landed in South Africa to be herded in the compounds like slaves, where they toiled under the lash of a cruel task-master, to enable their unscrupulous employers to revel in luxury in palatial homes in Park Lane, and to disport themselves in the most exclusive circles of the most select London society. It was within the memory of old Members that the President of the Board of Trade endeavoured to read in this House a schedule of the shareholders of a certain mine, and the right hon. Gentleman asked :—"Was it for these that we fought in the South African War; was it that these might enjoy their unholy gains, and engage in this inhuman traffic?" He wished he had time to deal with this subject fully so as to enlighten the misguided hon. Gentlemen below the gangway. He remembered in one of his travels meeting with the principal son of Brigham Young, and asking him how it was he managed to proselytise free people to his flock. He could quite understand one sex being drawn thither, but not the other sex. This son of Brigham Young admitted to him that their disciples or recruits were usually of the ignorant class, and he told him that he was opening up a new Jerusalem down in Mexico, and that the first thing he would do would be not to build a church but a theatre. The reason was that he found it best to educate the people through the eye and not through the ear. That was the reason for the processions which he had described going through the streets.

After all their declamations, were right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench going to remain silent now; were they going to allow a continuation of this slavery? [MINISTERIAL Cries of "No."] Was it to be said that what was vile under a Conservative Government was expedient and tolerable under a Liberal Government? The Radical Party was always tolerant and open to receive recruits. He was sure that the Under-Secretary for the Colonies would forgive him when he said that the hon. Gentleman thought that the whole intelligence of the Tory Party went over to the other Party when he left it. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] Yes, but circumstances had altered cases. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies spoke of the immoral contract of the late Government. Did the hon. Gentleman not know, and if he did not there were a sufficient number of eminent lawyers on the other side to tell him, that an immoral contract could be broken at any time? Why had the Government not broken these immoral contracts? It was now said that the Government was going to deal with this matter in a peddling and paltry way; they were going to pay the passages of some Chinese labourers home to China. That was not the way in which a past generation of Englishmen had dealt with slavery in the West Indies. When the West Indian negroes were emancipated, the Government of the day did not put money before honour, or economy before freedom. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite said that they were going to give self-government to the Transvaal and wash their hands of slavery. [Cries of "No, no!"] Yes. He knew it was an unfortunate expression to use; but he would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that there was a Roman governor 1,900 years ago who yielded to popular clamour, and washed his hands of responsibility. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] He was glad that hon. Gentlemen opposite were amused, but he would remind them that succeeding generations had execrated the memory and the action of that Roman governor. What right had His Majesty's Government to transfer the responsibility for slavery to the Transvaal? It was for them to deal with the matter, and if there was slavery, not a day ought to be allowed to pass before it was abolished. They talked about their huge majority. They were certainly a powerful body, but they appeared to have a feeble and vacillating mind. One section said that this was slavery, and another section said that it was not. One section said, "Leave it alone," and another section said "Get rid of it." A great deal has been heard about the national honour being besmirched, but more things than chickens and curses had a habit of coming home to roost. Promissory notes had to be met. The promissory notes of hon. Gentlemen opposite had matured, and they had to be met with that compound interest of which they had heard so much. If the directors of a new company invited subscriptions from the public and issued a prospectus, and if that prospectus contained anything misleading, or contained misrepresentation, the law decreed that the money should be returned to the shareholders. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were in the position of having captured votes and secured office on the strength of misrepresentation, and therefore it was their duty to go back to their shareholders and to return their votes by resignation. [Ironical laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite might laugh in their strength, but he ventured to prophesy that they would be dismissed from office at no distant time.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Who said that the Tory Party had not a leader?

*MR. HOUSTON said that no one knew the hon. Member better than he did and he took his remark goodnaturedly. He wished he had been able to move his own Amendment regretting that no immediate steps were to be taken for the abolition of Chinese labour, because he would have been able to make it perfectly clear that no Conservative could have voted for it without stultifying himself. In the same way, no one who had described Chinese labour as slavery could have voted against it without stultifying himself; and then he would have attained his object. He knew what the result of the division would be, and what an appeal to the packed jury of the Government Benches would result in, but in due time they would appeal to a higher court than the House of Commons, to the court of appeal of public opinion, and he had no doubt that the final verdict would be to the effect that those who described Chinese labour as slavery, and yet would not deal with it, were a set of political humbugs.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that early in the evening they had had a very interesting speech from the Minister for Education, and one passage of it was of importance to the Labour Members, who were anxious to know its real meaning. What he wanted to ask the Prime Minister was whether the new Transvaal constitution would prohibit indentured labour of any kind. This was a most important question to the Labour Members, who were all pledged to put an end to the abuse. He asked if the Chinese labourers would be permitted to reindenture themselves at the expiration of present contracts.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) thought it was very unfortunate in the interests of South Africa that this debate had taken place. A good deal of harm might be done by it. He had no interest in South Africa mines, but he had been out there and had seen for himself the necessity of introducing alien labour, if the mines were to be worked profitably. He wished to condemn strongly the recruiting of Kaffir labourers from Portuguese Africa who were driven by the recruiters, and who, when they came from tropical and sub-tropical countries, died on the high Rand from pneumonia. Last session he pointed out to Mr. Lyttelton the advisability of inserting a clause to allow the Chinaman to return home by paying his own passage, and a clause to that effect was inserted at his request, and already some 300 Chinese had availed themselves of that right and had returned to their own homes. Now the Government was going to give the right to any Chinese who might have been deceived to return to their own country at the expense of the State, and that would go far to meet the justice of the case. He would not now argue the merits or demerits of Chinese labour, but he wished to say that there was not a single mining engineer in this country or in South Africa, who had had any knowledge at all of mining affairs, who would say that it was possible to work the mines entirely without coloured labour. It was impossible to work the mines with white labour, but he would not argue that point. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?] Because it would take him at least a couple of hours to develop his argument. This was a question which could not be effectively dealt with upon the floor of the House of Commons, because it was one of the most difficult questions connected with mining. He believed that the Government were aware of all the difficulties, and he asked them to place their confidence in this matter in the man who had led them to victory. He wished to point out that all labour in South Africa to-day was servile labour. All coloured labour was servile, and no Kaffir could hold property or land in the Transvaal. Those were the conditions which had always prevailed even under the Boer Government. But be that as it might, those servile conditions were repugnant to the people of this country, who had been brought up under civilised conditions. It should be remembered, however, that in this question of labour in the mines they were dealing not with civilised people, but with savages, and matters must be regulated and determined accordingly. He had always advocated the principle of equal rights for all civilised men, but they had first to bring the savage into a state of civilisation, and then he was as much entitled to a vote as any white man and should enjoy the same rights and privileges. He urged the House to deal carefully with this question, and not make it more difficult for the Government of South Africa to deal with. The problem had been made more difficult by the war, which was wrong, and he hoped they would not repeat that mistake by any action they might take now. A good deal had been said about the cartoons which had been issued in regard to Chinese labour, but he would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that, at a former election, they issued placards representing little Englanders shooting Englishmen from behind a wall, and that was far worse than any cartoon which had been put forward at the recent election, although he agreed that those ought not to have been issued. But that was not the question for them to-day. Perhaps on this question he had made more sacrifices than any one else in the House. He had used language upon this subject which he ought not to have used, but he could not forget that the war in South Africa was a capitalistic war. Knowing how difficult the question was, he urged the House not to place the Transvaal itself in the extremely difficult position which would inevitably arise if they attempted to lay dow then conditions which the people of that country must finally adopt. No representative institutions had ever been granted to any British colony except by Act of Parliament. Was the Prime Minister going to follow out this precedent in South Africa? The state of South Africa to-day was probably worse and more serious than at any time before the war, and they had to deal now with a condition of affairs of very great gravity. Therefore it was necessary that whatever constitution was going to be granted it should be done at the earliest possible moment. He had advocated in the House, time after time, the granting of responsible government to South Africa, under which they would have the administration of their own affairs. If such a government had been established years ago they would not have been faced to-day with the Chinese labour question. He intended to vote for the Government, not because he did not believe in Chinese labour, but because what was said on the Treasury Bench and what was said on the hustings were not the same thing. [OPPOSITION cheers.] The present Lord Chancellor had said that he should always protest in the strongest possible manner against the servile conditions attached to Chinese labour in South Africa. He had always contended that if a Chinaman came into South Africa at all he should come in free, and he did not think that any Liberal could say that a Chinaman was not entitled to come in if he came in as a free man. He trusted that the hands of the Government would not be forced upon this question.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said the hon. Member who had just sat down had asked that this should not be made a Party question. He thought he was asking this rather late in the day, because if there was one thing more than another that was made a Party question at the recent election it was the question of the continuance of Chinese labour in South Africa. The hon. Member for the Mansfield Division had urged the Government to be strong in their attitude upon this subject. The hon. Member had been courageous throughout this controversy, for he had stood alone for years championing the cause of Chinese labour, and he was the only Member of the Liberal Party who did not vote in favour of the Motion condemning the action of the late Government upon this question. But he asked the Government to be cautious and look somewhat suspiciously upon advice given by an hon. Member who throughout had been a champion of the cause of Chinese labour. He wished to join in the hearty welcome which had been given to the hon. Member for the City of London upon his return to this House to take part in their debates. Although they differed from him in politics they welcomed him as one of the brightest ornaments of the Conservative Party. The hon. Member had spoken up gallantly and bravely for his colleagues, but how did the Conservative Party treat him a few years ago when he ventured to take a view of his own with regard to the great war of which they were now discussing the result? He remembered the hon. Member's appealing to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to use greater statesmanship in the carrying on of the negotiations, and he stated that if greater statesmanship had been employed the war might have been avoided. For saying that he was drummed out of the Conservative Party, and therefore he admired him to-night for the loyalty he had displayed in defending those who had so severely condemned him in the past. This Amendment condemned the action of the Government throughout the constituencies, and implied that they ought to take action at once in harmony with the declaration of the country and repatriate the Chinamen from South Africa. Chinese labour was one of the two great questions upon which the country gave a verdict at the recent election. The first issue was protection versus free trade, and the second was whether Chinese labour should be allowed to continue. The first question had been definitely settled, and the country was now anxious to know what the policy of the Government was going to be in regard to this very important question of Chinese labour. They approached this question to-night from a somewhat different standpoint from that of those who had brought forward this Amendment, the object of which was simply to harass the Government. The supporters of the Government approached the question with confidence and an intense desire that they should do their best to settle what they all recognised to be a very difficult question, and in the hope that they would be able to carry out their pledges with the least possible delay. The speech of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies was a very able performance, for he had to deal with a very delicate task, and he had had to express the views of the Government upon a very delicate question. The hon. Member seemed to him to have emphasised to too great an extent the fact that the Government repudiated the suggestion that any slavery existed in South Africa. He did not think that he used the phrase himself, but one of the issues which he placed before his constituency was that of the continuance of Chinese labour. Did slavery exist in South Africa? He wished to say emphatically that in his humble opinion slavery did exist at the present time in South Africa. In the first place, the Chinese were brought over practically imprisoned. They were landed and taken to the mines as prisoners, and they were kept in compounds and could not leave without the special permission of their employers. If a Chinaman was found in the public streets he was liable to arrest and he could be bought and sold [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."] He could be transferred from one group of mines to another without his consent. ["No, no."] The value of a Chinaman now had greatly increased, and he could be bought and sold so far as his labour was concerned. He was liable to arrest for being in the public streets, he had no opportunity of having a free trial for any offence he might be charged with, and those were conditions of slavery. A Chinaman could not belong to a trade union, he was kept practically a prisoner, with no free will of his own, and it was impossible for him to become a citizen; and if that was not slavery he did not know what slavery was. He could be flogged in the mine without any pretence of a trial. If there was one thing more certain than another it was that the electorate of this country had made up its mind that Chinese labour in South Africa was not to continue, and he wished to know whether that was going to be the policy of the Government. He fully appreciated the modifications in the Ordinance which had been alluded to, but they could be made either a dead letter or a means of sending every Chinamen back to China. He hoped the Government would be careful to adopt a policy which would tend to the peace of South Africa. The present state of things in South Africa was largely due to the fact that things were so unsettled and people did not know where they were. Were they going to hear from the Prime Minister that the whole situation was to be changed? They should not look at this question merely from a paltry Party point of view, but from an Imperial standpoint, and try to settle things permanently. Whatever the policy was to be they should be told clearly and without any doubt. He understood that it would be possible for a Chinaman under the new policy to remain in South Africa at least six years. He confessed that he did not like the prospect of going back to his constituency six years hence and informing them that, notwithstanding their large majority, they were unable to put an end to Chinese labour in South Africa. He did not for a moment believe that that was the desire of the Government, and he hoped it was not, because personally he—and he was sure many on that side of the House—hoped and believed the Government had a programme to carry out, and they were going to enact measures for the welfare of the great masses of the people as a whole, and they did not wish the Government to adopt any policy that would in any sense weaken the confidence that the great masses of the people had in them. Therefore he desired this question to be settled with the least possible delay. The circumstances under which the Ordinance was given were peculiar and exceptional. A Government which had not the confidence of the country was responsible for it. Every colony protested against it, and it had not the support of the great mass of the people in South Africa. If ever there was a case in which a contract ought to be broken it was this. Why should not the Government take the responsibility themselves of getting the Chinamen out of South Africa? This was a matter which ought not to be left to the colony itself when it received self-government. This country was responsible for the introduction of Chinese labour. It was brought in under peculiar conditions. This country had spent £250,000,000 in South Africa and 25,000 lives had been sacrificed. The voice of this country had a right to be heard in the settlement of South Africa. Now it had to wait, as he understood, for self-government in the colony. There was to be no settlement of this matter until it had been thrashed out under the new constitution to be created. [Cries of "No."] Well, let Ministers say. He contended that there was to be no permanent settlement of this matter until the constitution to be created in the Transvaal had been heard upon it, and the people had expressed their opinion through that constitution. If they took the responsibility of sending back the Chinese all would be well. But suppose the new authority should be in favour of continuing the employment of the Chinese in South Africa, were the Government going to take the responsibility of that? He hoped sincerely they were not. He suggested that the way to give effect to what he believed to be the general policy of the Party in this matter was to insert a clause in the Transvaal Constitution which could leave no doubt whatever what would happen. There was an almost similar case with regard to California, where the question of Chinese labour was raised, and it was considered to be in the best interests of the State that that labour should not be continued. A clause was, therefore, inserted in the new constitution forever prohibiting Asiatic coolieism in the State and declaring that all contracts for such labour would be void. He appealed to His Majesty's Government to make their action as permanent as possible, and, above all, to let this country and South Africa know what the policy was to be. He did not suggest that all the Chinamen should be at once taken back—in one way that would be extremely difficult—but, in the first place, would it not be advisable to insert such a clause in the constitution, or to name an appointed day when Chinamen should cease to live in South Africa? The mine-owners would then be able to make the necessary arrangements. The Under-Secretary that night had pleaded on behalf on the investor. Well, he thought the investor in this matter had a very poor chance indeed; the great magnates of the mining houses took good care of that. The mining magnates made more money when markets went down than when they went up, and therefore the small investor had a very poor chance indeed in their hands; therefore he did not think they need consider him very much in the matter. The country had had full warning that there was a possibility of a Liberal Government coming in to deal with this subject. He was grateful for the step that had been taken by the Government, but he hoped they would go a little further and name a day on which this matter would come into operation, thus giving the House reason to believe—as he should believe until he heard to the contrary—that the Government were anxious to carry out what certainly was the expressed will of the electorate.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) said he desired to read a few extracts from election addresses and speeches of members of the Government in support of the contention that some of them had described the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery. The Prime Minister, in his election address, said—

> "South Africa has been reduced to a condition in which loss of property, nay, even ruin, can only be avoided by the use of servile labour mported in unlimited quantities from China."

There was, in the first place, some exaggeration in that statement. The Chinese were not being imported into South Africa in unlimited quantities. British South Africa consisted of seven different Colonies and Protectorates, and they occupied an area of about 1,500,000 square miles. In only one of these was Chinese labour being introduced, namely, the Transvaal, which covered only an area of 111,000 square miles. And they were not being introduced in every part of the Transvaal. They were being introduced in only a small part of that colony—the mining district. And they were not being introduced in unlimited quantities because their number was limited by the requirements of the mines. Therefore he was justified in saying there was some exaggeration in the statement of the Prime Minister in his election address. The right hon. Gentleman had used the words "servile labour." Now, servile labour was slave labour. It was no use mincing matters and using a Latin word instead of an English one. He would next turn to the President of the Local Government Board, who said—

> "South Africa is over-officered, over-governed, costly, dominated by a sordid unpatriotic section of speculating slave-owners."

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "I am against slavery, coolie, indentured or contract coloured labour under the British flag."

The Prime Minister had stated, in doubtful Latin, that slavery existed in South Africa, and the President of the Local Government Board made the same statement in undeniable English. He now came to the President of the Board of Education, who in a speech at Bristol said—

> "With regard to the repatriation of the Chinese from South Africa, that he thought all who wanted to return home should be sent back, but to break a three years' contract would mean damages which he was afraid the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be able to contemplate with equanimity, nor would, he thought, the people of this country who were looking for the abatement of taxes."

Apparently the President of the Board of Education was in favour of repatriating the Chinese at once, but evidently thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was afraid of the expense. When it was considered that this country spent £20,000,000 to free the slaves in the West Indies, it was an aspersion on the people of this country to say that they would not be prepared to pay for the liberation of slaves in South Africa. Then, there was the President of the Board of Trade, who said—

> "He was told that poor Chinamen in South Africa did not work half so well chained in compounds as they did at home."

They never had been chained in compounds. They undoubtedly lived in compounds. He himself had lived in a compound for the best part of ten years; there was no hardship about it. The President of the Board of Trade was asked at one of his meetings what would happen supposing the Transvaal to declare in favour of retaining Chinese labour. The right hon. Gentleman replied—

> "I am reminded of a reply of Abraham Lincoln, who said, 'I never cross the Fox River until I come to it.'"

He would point out, that so strongly did Abraham Lincoln oppose slavery in the United States that he prosecuted a sanguinary war against his own countrymen in order to suppress it. Would the right hon. Gentleman do as much, because if not the parallel between the President of the Board of Trade and the President of the United States was somewhat incomplete? Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in one of his speeches, on December 12th—

> "It was thought necessary that the Chinamen should be segregated and secluded—that a kind of ring fence should be erected around them, and within that ring fence all their movements should be made. Now, gentlemen, that is a state of things which some people have called slavery. I have never used the term myself, but I must say, if you ask me whether it more resembles a state of slavery or of freedom, I have little difficulty in answering the question."

With characteristic caution the right hon. Gentleman did not proceed to answer the question. These statements he had quoted bore very strongly on the Amendment before the House. Some of the members of the Ministry had definitely stated that Chinese labour was slavery, and others had hinted or suggested that it was slavery. All he could say was that if it were slavery it should be abolished at any cost or any sacrifice, and if it were not slavery, then those Ministers and their followers who had so described it had been guilty of grossly misleading the people of this country.

*MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) said the Members of this House were not only met, he took it, to legislate in their collective wisdom, but also to speak for the men who had sent them there. He was under a pledge, and there were many other Members who, though they might not be under a definite pledge, as he was, were nevertheless under an implicit pledge to say what he wished to say that night. The pledge he was under was that when he entered the House of Commons, if this question should arise, he would suggest—and a private Member with no knowledge even of the customs of the House could do no more than suggest—that Chinese labour in South Africa should be put an end to, and that the cost of putting it to an end should fall upon those men whom all England hated from the bottom of the heart—those men to whom this country owed the loss of its military prestige, those men who had captured the Press and who talked of themselves as Britishers yet would not allow an Englishman to express a free opinion in this country. He earnestly asked first, that a date should be fixed within three months, during which the first batch at least of the Chinamen should leave South Africa; secondly, that the rate of their full repatriation should be fixed within the same delay, and thirdly, that the cost should fall upon those men on whom it should deservedly fall.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said he did not rise because he was bound, as was the previous speaker, by any inconvenient pledge to his constituents, but because, in the first place, he was one of a very few Members in the House who had to fight two elections in which the Chinese question had arisen; in the second place, because he was not able to follow the different definitions of slavery or servile labour; and, thirdly, because he felt it was his duty to protest on the first possible opportunity against the abominable practice which had been carried on in the last election, and at the bye-elections immediately before, of attempting not only to vilify political opponents, but to vilify people who were 6,000 miles away, and had no opportunity of defending themselves against the statements circulated for political purposes which not only had not been proved, but to prove which no attempt had been made. Chinese labour had been described as slavery, as semi-slavery, as servile labour, and as serfdom. The Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs had mentioned certain items in the Transvaal Ordinance which in his opinion made it an Ordinance of slavery, but none of those items were going to be altered by the present Government. Those hon. Gentlemen who were returned on the ground that they were going to put down slavery which now existed under the Transvaal Ordinance, if they were going to support the views of the present Government, owed some apology to the people whom they had traduced during the election.

He should like to ask what was the difference between slavery and labour under servile conditions? The hon. Member for Liverpool had defined a slave as being a man who was not entitled to hold property. According to the statement made by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies the reason why the Transvaal Ordinance was so inferior to that in force in British Guiana was that the Chinese were not allowed to remain in South Africa whilst indentured labourers in British Guiana could remain. He should have thought that compelling a person to come into your service and not allowing him to leave it was slavery. He was now told that slavery meant allowing a man to come into your service if he liked and compelling him to go at the end of a certain time. He wished to call attention to an instance given in the Blue-book of the sort of way in which people had been got at in South Africa on this question. On page 2 there appeared a letter from Mr. F. C. Boland to the *Morning Leader* bringing specific charges against the managers of two South African mines. Those charges were published with illustrations, and circulated throughout many of the constituencies in England at the last election. They were published without any effort being made to ascertain their truth. If they were correct why did Mr. Boland allow such things to go on whilst he was corresponding with the newspapers, instead of at once going to the superintendent of foreign labour and making a complaint to him of the improper treatment of the Chinese labourers which was alleged to be going on? On page 21 of the Blue-book they would find in an interview with the superintendent of foreign labour that Mr. Boland gave him to understand that his business as a journalist was not so much to bring cases of outrages to the notice of the proper authorities as to manufacture from them sensational articles for publication in the Press. Practically all Mr. Boland's assertions were denied and found to be untrue as soon as inquiry was instituted. It was shown that only two petitions had been handed in from the coolies; one of them was in favour of the resumption of corporal punishment because they preferred it to the punishment which had been substituted for it, and the other petition stated that they were being treated well and were in fact receiving the same treatment as parents meted out to their children. That did not prove the truth of the charges made in Mr. Boland's articles. One of the complaints of the coolies was that they were made to do military drill which was not provided for in the Ordinance, and the drill was immediately stopped. In the Blue-book it transpired that a good deal of Mr. Boland's statements were derived from a dissatisfied compound manager, Mr. Pless, who had quarrelled with his employer, and who had announced his intention of making it hot for the mineowners. To do this, Mr. Pless took a Chinaman to his own house, tied him up and left him from 7 o'clock one night until 11 o'clock next morning, and at the end of that time, after various minor tortures he photographed the Chinaman, with the alleged purpose of publishing a book to illustrate slave-driving on the Rand. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool said on the question of bringing the criminals to justice, that the principal criminals sat on the front Opposition Bench, and the chief amongst them was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham.

MAJOR SEELY: I do not wish to go back upon my statement, but in the sense of the right hon. Gentleman being a criminal I withdrew the word at the time.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN asked where were the criminals sitting who were responsible for the torture of that poor Chinaman who was taken to Mr. Pless's house and tortured and then photographed for electioneering purposes? Hon. Members opposite were familiar with the laws of supply and demand, and he wanted to know where the demand for such photographs as these came from; these would not have been supplied if there had not been a demand for them.

*MR. CHURCHILL said if blackguards were employed by the Labour Importation Agency it was possible that ruffianly things would be done.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN could not accept that as an explanation, for why, if there was a blackguard in the case, was he not prosecuted?

*MR. CHURCHILL: Telegrams have been despatched to ascertain whether it is possible to frame charges against Mr. Pless. Even in China he might not be beyond British jurisdiction; and if a charge could be made against him it was possible that the truth might be elicited at a judicial inquiry.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN: That leads to another question. I should like to know when that telegram was sent.

*MR. CHURCHILL: Long before the hon. Gentleman made his Speech.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said that answer showed the telegram had only just been sent. He compared the anxiety of the Government, acting on Mr. Boland's discredited letter, to obtain information against the gentlemen connected with the Witwatersrand Deep Mine with their action against Mr. Pless, in whose case they took no action until after the election.

*MR. CHURCHILL said that perhaps the hon. Member would allow him to try to answer this question. Lord Selborne was engaged in considering whether Mr. Boland's allegations disclosed a case for prosecution against the people incriminated, and he reported on 10th January that no prosecution had been instituted. Until they knew that Lord Selborne considered Mr. Boland's allegations did not justify a prosecution, it was obvious they could not consider whether they should take steps against Mr. Boland himself. As soon as the Government knew that Mr. Boland's charges not sufficiently well established they were proceeded to take the steps which the hon. Member suggested they had taken tardily, to proceed against Mr. Pless.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said he was talking about proceedings against Mr. Pless and not Mr. Boland. His point was that the Government had telegraphed out in a hurry to find some ground for prosecuting the Witwatersrand Mine people, but had delayed to take steps against Pless. He contended that the Government were unnecessarily in a hurry to prosecute the mineowners without affidavits, but they were unnecessarily slow in proceeding against those who had made these false charges when they had got an affidavit in support of the prosecution. Some steps had now been taken after the election to bring Mr. Pless to justice. The evidence given in the Blue-book had been mainly given by people who had since gone to China, and therefore they could not be cross-examined. [An Hon. Member : " What about Whittaker Wright."] And now with regard to the monstrous behaviour, on evidence unsubstantiated and unproved, such as this, of accusing people 6,000 miles away of the vilest practices which they would all condemn and then using such accusations for the purpose of getting into Parliament. It was a revelation to him to hear the hon. Member for Northampton accusing, without venturing to specify the names, people in South Africa of engineering a policy in the interests of bloodthirsty money grabbers. Who were they ? [" Germans."] They were, he said, mostly of foreign extraction. Were there no gentlemen of foreign extraction sitting on the Ministerial side ? Was that any detriment to their merits ? [" No."] Why did the hon. Member opposite come here and bring an accusation of that kind ?

Mr. PAUL (Northampton) said he made the accusation because he believed it, and he was thankful as an Englishman to think that they were mostly foreigners and did not disgrace the name of Englishmen.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN : The hon. Member said they were without honour, but let him mention their names. [Opposition cries of " Name, name."] He further said they were men without conscience, and without God. [Renewed cries of, " Name."] It was quite a revelation to him as a new Member to hear hon. Members accusing nameless people in this reckless fashion. The hon. Member had attacked men 6,000 miles away who could not defend themselves in that House. Plucky, was it not ? That was like an Englishman and not like a foreigner. He had intervened because he felt it his duty to protest against conduct such as that. The people of the Transvaal were a British community, and they were just as fond of liberty as the people in this country, and they were just as deserving of fairplay from politicians. He believed politics would be best conducted under that system of charity which thought no evil, which did not rejoice in iniquity, but which did rejoice in the truth.

Motion made, and Question, " That the Debate be now adjourned." (*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Ordered, That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of fifteen members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of, Mr. Ashton, Mr. Blake, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Holden, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Snowdon, and Colonel Williams.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum. (*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 23rd February, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Burslem, Greenock, and Hanley; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Petition from London, for reduction; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION.)

Copy presented, of further Papers regarding the Administration of the Army in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Wakefield and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the city [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (PHOTOGRAPHS AND MEASUREMENTS OF PRISONERS.)

Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 22nd February, 1906, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, under Section 8 of The Penal Servitude Act, 1891, applying the provisions of the Regulations, dated 20th June, 1896, relating to the Measuring and photographing of Prisoners to any Alien in respect of whom a certificate has been given under Section 3 (1) of The Aliens Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CONSOLIDATED FUNDS.

Abstract Account presented, showing the issues made from the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom in the financial year ended 31st March, 1905, for the interest and Management of the Debt, for the Civil List, and for all other Issues in the financial year for services charged directly on the said Fund; with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 53.]

GREEK LOAN.

Accounts presented, up to 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No 54.]

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 645 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions, Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1905 [by Act]; to be printed [No. 55.]

Building Societies, Copy of Eleventh Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, etc. [by Act]; to be presented. [No. 56.]

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS (INCLUDING TELEPHONES.

Copy ordered "of Account showing the gross amount received and the gross amount expended in respect of the Telegraph Service, including Telephones, from the date of the Transfer of the Telegraphs to the State to the 31st day of March, 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 124, of Sessions 1905)."—*(Mr. Sydney Buxton.)*

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (NON-PROVIDED SCHOOL.

Return ordered, " of the Schools in England and Wales recognised on the 1st day of January, 1906, as Non-Provided Public Elementary Schools, showing as far as practicable the tenure of the premises of such Schools and the character of the trusts, if any, to which the premises are subject under any trust deeds or instruments or otherwise."—*(Mr. Birrell.)*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Welsh Tithes.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can give, by parishes and counties, any changes that may have occurred in the tithes, glebe, and properties of the Church in Wales since the issue of Parliamentary Paper, No. 240, Session 1894, and any changes in the disposition of the revenue derived from those sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am in correspondence with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners upon this matter, but I have not yet obtained from them the information I require in order to answer the Question. If the hon. Member will kindly put down the Question again in three or four days' time, I shall then be able to give him a considered reply.

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies—Supplementary Estimate.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what sum has been allocated for the repatriation of Chinese coolies; and when the Supplementary Estimate will be presented.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) It is not possible to make a definite statement at present.

Drainage of Lough Neagh—Report of Sir A. Binnie.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has yet received the Report of Sir Alexander Binnie with reference to the drainage of Lough Neagh; and, if so, when he proposes to make its contents public.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Sir Alexander Binnie's Report has been received, and is in the hands of the printer. I propose to lay it upon the Table at an early date.

Criminal Proceedings Against Mr. H. Pless.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when the telegram suggesting criminal proceedings against Mr. H. Pless was sent, and when an answer to this telegram is expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The telegram was sent on the 15th instant, and inquired whether his offence was one for which his surrender could be claimed. The answer is expected immediately. The Law Officers of the Transvaal Government had advised, with regard to prosecutions generally, that there was no ground for the institution of proceedings on the evidence supplied, but it was thought desirable by the Secretary of State to institute legal proceedings in this case, if at all possible.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House do, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn until Monday next —(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [22nd February] to Main Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign*,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Which Amendment was—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenour of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end.'"—(*Mr. H. W. Forster.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate resumed.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the charge made on the previous day from the Front Opposition Bench against the Liberal Party was absolutely clear, and quite as offensive as it was clear. The charge was that they had deliberately distorted the facts about Chinese labour for electioneering purposes; that they had climbed into power upon those distorted facts; and that, having climbed into power, they proposed now to abandon those unfortunate coolies to a condition of service which many of them had described as slavery, and all of them had hotly denounced. The charge showed a very poor appreciation of the intelligence of the country. Did hon. Gentlemen opposite really think it was possible that the Liberals could have vamped up, and for two years carried on, a baseless agitation, and then have swept the country as they had with such electoral success upon fraud and misrepresentation? If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham were present he would tell a very different tale as to the possibility of success under such circumstances. The fact was that the Chinese labour agitation was absolutely spontaneous on the part of an outraged people. It began before any one in the House had an opportunity of opening his mouth outside the Chamber; it began when the Ordinance came before Parliament in 1904. It at once became acute, so acute that the Government of the day would not let the House see the Regulations before they were passed. It became so acute that before the Ordinance was discussed or before the Regulations were made public the Government had to give pledges and assurances in order to satisfy the public mind, though the bulk of those pledges had never been carried out. One of the assurances upon which this Ordinance was carried was given by Lord Onslow. Lord Onslow in another place on February 12th, 1904, said—

> "What is proposed is to bring in an experimental batch of 10,000 Chinese coolies."

That was to allay public opinion. There were now 50,000 coolies in South Africa, and very shortly there would be 60,000. Then the British workmen got apprehensive and conceived the idea that this was an endeavour to undercut the Kaffirs, but Mr. Lyttelton assured everybody that the coolie would get at least 2s. a day. Without that assurance the Ordinance could not have been passed. What happened to that assurance? They heard on the previous night that the wages were not 60s. a month, but 33s. 6d., not making allowance for numerous fines. Then the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Worcester and the Bishop of Rochester all began to be apprehensive. Would any hon. Gentleman suggest that they were the victims of Radical misrepresentation? They rose in their places in another House and expressed the gravest apprehension of what would arise. They suggested the possibility—he put it no higher—of this Ordinance introducing into the new Colonies the most filthy forms of Oriental vice. Mr. Lyttelton at once gave an assurance that that could not arise because, he said—

> "Manifestly it would be most improper if the coolies should come without their women folk."

And that was repeated by Lord Onslow in the other House. What was the sequel? To-day upon the Rand there were 50,000 Chinese men and two women. They would be infernal hypocrites if they allowed those things to continue, and he urged the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies to make a most serious representation to the Government as to the obvious Oriental vices that would go on in the case of men huddled together, and that he would consider gravely this aspect of the case as demanding the early sweeping away of the whole system. This was not a manufactured agitation at all. It was the result of spontaneous feeling in the country, so spontaneous that the Ordinance was only passed in the year 1904 by the most reckless assurances and pledges scattered right and left. And directly that Ordinance was passed, and before the general election—which was much, too much, delayed—was in anybody's mind at all, the members of the late Government went up and down the country apologising for their own enactment and not always with strict regard to accuracy. He recollected the bye-election at Chertsey. Mr. Balfour sent a telegram to the Chertsey electorate in July, 1904, in which he said—

> "All fair-minded men will remember that those labourers who come willingly on the terms offered to them have been introduced into the Transvaal at the express wish of the white population."

Mr. Lyttelton, in his recent disastrous election campaign, said to the people of Leamington that—

> "The people of the Transvaal themselves passed the Ordinance, and was His Majesty's Government to veto the law?"

When right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite spoke about distortion, what would they think of statements of that kind? What were the facts? With regard to the passage of the Labour Ordinance, the Legislative Council who passed it consisted of twenty-seven individuals not one of whom was elected, thirteen were paid officials, and fourteen were official nominees. This Ordinance was passed by twenty-two to four, that was to say, thirteen paid officials and nine official nominees. That was the express wish of the people of the Transvaal! After that the less they heard of misrepresentation from hon. Members opposite the better. These apologies, repeated every time Tory candidates faced the music, were necessary because of the indignation of the people long before the general election was thought of. What was said at the Hampstead bye-election of 1904? This was the report of the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 17th—

> "Mr. Fletcher was mildly interrogated by a few of the malcontents present, but after one or two wordy duels they collapsed before his clear and emphatic replies."

That was all right, no doubt, but what did that report from the *Pall Mall Gazette* go on to say—

> "What about Chinese labour in South Africa, was one question, and amid cheers Mr. Fletcher said—'I am sincerely sorry that it was necessary to engage Chinese labour, but it was done at the request of the Transvaal Government."

That was a gentleman not very sure of his ground when he came before the electorate of Hampstead. He also remembered the bye-election at Dulwich in December, 1903. Long before agitation could have possibly arisen what happened there? Placarded all over Dulwich was as follows—

> "Electors of Dulwich, beware if any attempts are made to lead you to believe that Dr. Rutherfoord Harris is favouring the introduction of Chinese labour, remember it is a lie."

What did all that mean? It took place long before they had an opportunity of creating any agitation if they had wished to. This was the spontaneous act of an outraged people. It was the result of the spontaneous abhorrence of the country. They thought the great name of Englishmen had been prostituted, the name that the seven seas over had always been synonymous with freedom and fair play. They felt that the great flag floating in the sky, a latter-day covenant to assure to all who came under it liberty and justice, had had put upon it an indelible stain. Those who supported the Government had been told by the hon. Member for Sevenoaks and the right hon. Member for Dover that their criticisms and the course that they had taken had given great offence to the Colonies. That was an extraordinary statement. It was the Ordinance itself which had given the gravest offence to the Colonies. Let them take Australia, where this resolution was passed through both branches of the Federal Legislature—

> "This House records its grave objection to the introduction of Chinese labour into the Transvaal until a referendum of the white population of the Colony has been taken on the subject, or responsible government is granted."

He well remembered reading the debate which took place in the Federal House upon this question, and it was taken part in by Mr. Hughes, who had taken up the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hughes said this—

> "For my part, speaking as far as I am able on behalf of my constituents, I will never cast a vote for the dispatch of another Australian contingent to take part in a war if such an Ordinance as that now proposed be carried into effect."

Mr. Deakin, speaking as Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, said—

> "We were told at the outbreak of hostilities in South Africa that it was a war for the miners of the Transvaal. If the authorities had gone on to say that it was a war for Chinese miners, what a different aspect it would have worn! Why were we not told of this outcome at the commencement of the struggle? We should then have said, Keep your mines, your cheapness is too dearly purchased. It is not to be bought with blood."

And Mr. Reid, now the Prime Minister, but then the Leader of the Opposition, said—

> "The Chinese stimulant to Empire building is peculiarly offensive to Australian sentiment: it lowers the best Imperial Standards to put capitalistic interests before colonising ideals. Slower progress under better auspices is best."

Then let them turn to New Zealand.

> "As with Australia so with New Zealand. On January 19th the New Zealand Legislature

made urgent representations to the Home Government against its pernicious proposals. The Government of New Zealand foresees grave perils, racial, social, political and sanitary as bound to follow in the train of this fatal step."

He would wind up this series of quotations with one from the right hon. gentleman Mr. Seddon, the Imperialist Premier of New Zealand. That gentleman was not a victim of Radical misrepresentation. Mr. Seddon said—

"I boldly say that whether the Australian Colonies gave little or much help to South Africa during the Boer war, that help would not have been given if it had been dreamed that its effect would be to enable white labour to be excluded or penalised while Chinese or other Asiatics were to be introduced and encouraged."

That was a view he commended to hon. Members opposite. They might say that the people of this country were all fools in the way in which they were misled, but they would hardly extend that compliment to the people of our Colonies. Hon. Members knew as well as he did that opinion in Canada was unanimous against the Ordinance, and the same remark was true of British Columbia, where, as in every other part of the Empire, they were not in favour of it. There was a terrible person named Frank Boland, of whom they had heard in this debate. He had, it appeared, sent home some terrible statements to a very terrible paper called the *Morning Leader*. From what had been said in that debate it would appear that this Mr. Frank Boland was a liar of the very first water. As to that, what did Lord Selborne say about this man's statements on page 21 of the Blue-book?—

"It is not denied and indeed I have already informed you that prior to June, 1905, the illegal corporal punishment after trial by the mine authorities was widely resorted to as a disciplinary measure on the mines of the Witwatersrand"

When was the Government going to ask Lord Milner why he permitted flogging? They were entitled to have an answer to that question, and he hoped that they would be informed why Lord Milner permitted it—

"and it cannot be disputed that where administered it was administered in the manner described in Mr. Boland's letter, *i.e.*, in a manner borrowed from the practice of the Chinese court of justice. I do not defend such proceedings, but I repeat what I have already stated, that I am convinced that they have entirely ceased since Mr. Jamieson's assumption of office as superintendent of foreign labour."

From that he would say that instead of being abused in this House Mr. Boland ought to receive the thanks of Parliament. With regard to the horizontal beam, which was so hotly denied on the other side, Lord Selborne said—

"The statements made later on in Mr. Boland's letter as to the use of a horizontal beam in the lock-up of the Witwatersrand mine are also, as you will observe, refuted in the general manager's and the Chinese compound manager's reports."

But let the House see what happened—

"The reason why such a beam is placed in the lock-up is, to my mind, satisfactorily explained. If the ringleaders in a riot between coolies were placed in the lock-up prior to trial without being fastened to a beam to keep them apart from each other, further fighting and probably bloodshed would ensue."

That was a most cryptic statement, even for a Government Blue-book. As he was not Oriental in his mind, he could not follow it. The despatch proceeded—

"As to Mr. Boland's statement with regard to the Witwatersrand deep mine, the superintendent of foreign labour has not yet received any reply to the enquiries which he has addressed to the management."

That was true in regard to a number of Mr. Boland's allegations. It continued—

"I hear from him, however, that illegal flogging was carried on in this as in other mines prior to June, 1905. The mine is a large one, employing over 3,000 Chinese, who comprise an unusually large proportion of turbulent characters. It may be incidentally mentioned that the coolies on this particular mine have of their own accord petitioned the superintendent of foreign labour that corporal punishment may be once more resorted to for offences committed by them."

He supposed that was true, or should he say officially true? At all events it made a large tax upon his imagination. He would quote another example of the sweet simplicity of the "Heathen Chinee." As great objections were taken to Mr. Boland's statement, he would quote something which he thought ought to find acceptance on the other side of the House. He was sorry to say there were headlines in it, and he was glad, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover was not present, for he had raised the greatest objection to headlines last night. He would say in correction of the right hon. Gentleman that his suggestion that the headlines of the

Morning Leader article were set out so as to catch the public eye and not in chronological order was inaccurate. They were set out in the order in which they were received. The headlines he would now read were—

> "Chinese outrages in South Africa. The Chunchuses of the Rand. A record of murder and loot. The Transvaal is fighting its own peculiar yellow peril. For the moment it is a land under the shadow of the Chinese danger. Away in the country districts men manufacture weapons of defence and barricade their houses by night, and women dread to be left alone. They fear the Chunchuses of the Rand. East, West, and North, always Chinese. The matter is serious. Chinese loot a lonely farm and murder the occupant. Chinese raid stores, and kill the proprietors with knives and butchers' cleavers. Chinese fight Kaffirs away on the Veldt and get killed; murdered Chinese are found in out-of-the-way spots; mounted police organise drives against Chinese; mobile columns sweep the country, rounding up Chinese."

Then the writer went on to describe the wholesale desertions—

> "How many wanderers are there? No one knows. Official figures report only 524 missing from the mines at a given time, out of a total of 44,000. The un-official world thrusts tongue in cheek, and talks in four figures. Anti-mines newspapers hint at murders never made public. An indignant Chamber of Mines denounces exaggeration, defends Chinese; temporary troubles; agitators; repatriate bad characters; all well. Unofficial world scoffs openly, and hints Chinese not fit for mines, calls for more police, calls for strict compound system. Who is right? I do not know. No one knows."

Now he would give a final quotation—

> "Why this leakage from the mines? Did these men know in China that their work lay a thousand odd feet below the surface of the earth, or did they think that the gold mines of the Rand were like the tin mines of the Straits? The Chamber of Mines say they knew. Are they beaten? The Chamber of Mines say they are not. Then why do they desert? No one knows. But by fours and fives, and fifteens and twenties, they wander away across the great uplands, going they know not whither, living they know not how."

That was not Mr. Boland or the *Morning Leader.* It was from the London *Daily Mail*, of September 25th last, a paper which, of course, never overstated the facts of the case. He had said, and he said now, that the Ordinance was thoroughly vicious and thoroughly bad. He had called it slavery on many a platform in this country, and he called it slavery now, although he had no doubt he should be taken, under escort by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, to the Clock Tower. The hon. Gentleman was vehement—he thought a little ostentatiously so—the previous day in announcing to the world at large that he did not think it was slavery. But he did call it "a flagrant act of folly and iniquity." It was only a question of terms. The hon. Gentleman had used seven words, and he (Dr. Macnamara) used one, but they came very near to the same result. Liberals had fought against this Ordinance, and they were not hypocrites when they did that. On their hands now was this evil legacy of the mad folly of the late Government, and he felt that this thing must come to an end. There must be no weakening about it. They had to get the Chinese coolies out of South Africa, or, if they remained there, it was their Imperial duty, whilst not interfering in local political matters, to see that they stayed there as free men. What did the Government intend to do? The Under-Secretary had said that they intended to let it peter out by a natural process of exhaustion. He hoped that process would be facilitated by every possible means. The precise means by which it was to peter out were rehearsed by the hon. Gentleman last night, and stated by the Prime Minister in the Albert Hall, and on Tuesday in the debate on the Address. First of all, there was to be no more importations, and so far good; but he wanted to ask the Government if they would institute a strict inquiry as to who were responsible for hustling 16,000 fresh coolies into the Transvaal at the last moment.

*MR. CHURCHILL (Manchester, N.W.) said the licences were signed by Sir A. Lawley, the Lieutenant-Governor. Lord Selborne had stated that he did not know that the licences had been issued, and it was no part of his business to be notified. The officer directly responsible was, of course, the Lieutenant-Governor.

*DR. MACNAMARA said he did not wish to press the matter against a public servant who was not there to answer for himself, but he thought that Lord Selborne and Sir A. Lawley should be communicated with. It was the view of many of the supporters of the Government that these additional coolies had been hustled in, and in a way which conflicted with the evident sentiments and intention of the Government of the day.

However, there was to be no more importation, and that was so far good. Then there was to be an overhauling of the Ordinance in the interests of humanity. The cost of repatriation was to be paid out of Imperial funds. He would suggest to the Government that they should not build too great hopes on the amount of repatriation. The great bulk of the Chinese coolies who came from North China under this Ordinance were men who, if they went back before their completed term of service, would have a very warm time indeed, and therefore too great hopes should not be built upon repatriation. One thing which the Government ought to do was to cancel the clause providing for re-enlistment. There was no legal reason why the clause providing for re-enlistment should not be cancelled. There might be the moral reason that the coolies had been got there under that idea, and, if so, it was not for him to break in upon that understanding. But if the Government could reasonably and honourably abrogate the clause providing for re-enlistment they would round off a great effort to clear away a bad legacy left by the late Government. He hoped, therefore, that the point would have the careful consideration of the Government, otherwise six years hence there would be at least 16,000 coolies on the Rand. He for one, not as a mere electioneer, but as a Britisher, would be a very unhappy man if six months hence there were very considerable numbers of Chinese on the Rand. These Chinese had got to go and as soon as possible. The position of the rank and file of the Liberal Party was admirably summed up in a speech by the President of the Board of Education last night. His right hon. friend said—

> "The country, he did not doubt, hated Chinese labour. He hated it. The country was ashamed of Chinese labour, and he was ashamed of it."

Then his right hon. friend went on to rehearse what the Government proposed to do, and added a sentence at the close upon which he (Dr. Macnamara) pinned all his hopes. His right hon. friend said—

> "The Government had dealt with this state of things courageously and usefully—no further importation allowed; repatriation permitted; amendments in the Ordinance approved of and ordered, and significant, grave, and, he doubted not, effective language that went to show that these labour conditions were objectionable to the English Government and to the British people, and they could not, and would not, be approved of in time to come under any circumstances whatever."

He wanted the Government to live up to those aspirations stated by his right hon. friend. Chinese labour must come to an end, and the sooner the better; but it does not lie in the mouths of hon. Members opposite to complain that the Government cannot in a moment or two make good and redress the ravages which have been made by the mad folly and short-sightedness of the late Ministry.

*EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I do not propose to intervene for more than a very few minutes in this debate. The Party for which I speak occupies, as the Under-Secretary for the Colonies has reminded us, a much smaller space in this House than it did when he honoured us with his confidence, but it is too early in the life of this Parliament for us to expect among the serried battalions opposite an exhibition of that independence of which the hon. Member opposite has been so ardent an advocate and exponent. All we can do at the present time in regard to this question is to state our case, register our protest, and await a verdict on that protest not in the division Lobbies of the House of Commons, but at the by-elections which will be occurring in the constituencies. Those constituencies, I think, will before very long have realised how grossly their confidence has been abused. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies, who was put up yesterday to perform the eminently Chinese task of saving the Government's face, successfully brushed away the frail foundations upon which this agitation against Chinese labour has been built. The hon. Member for the Mansfield Division told us that this was a House of Commons Amendment, and that nobody would be more sorry than the members of the Opposition to see it carried. In that the hon. Member was entirely mistaken, for it exactly expresses our views. This Amendment is not a censure upon the policy of the Government. On the contrary, so far as the main principle of their policy is concerned, that Chinese labour is not to be prohibited in the Transvaal pending the decision of the legislature of the Transvaal itself, and that when that decision is given, no matter what it may be, it will be respected—I say that that policy though we cannot admit that it is an "intellectual" one, so far as it represents the settled purpose of the Government, and is not a compromise between contending sections of the Cabinet and liable to alteration under pressure from the more ardent but less well-informed among their supporters has our support, and we shall offer the Government all our assistance to enable them to adhere to the decision at which they have arrived. But precisely because we approve of the policy and because it is the policy of the late Government, we deny the right of the present Government to carry it out, or, so far as this question is concerned, to occupy the Ministerial Benches at all. We have been told by the hon. Member for North Camberwell that the late Government had no mandate to introduce Chinese labour. I would like to know what mandate has the present Government got to sanction its continuance? Your whole position is utterly unconstitutional. Before you had been a fortnight in office, before studying the facts, before you had even appealed to the people of this country, Lord Elgin issued his dispatch temporarily suspending the free importation of Chinese labour. You had no mandate for taking any step of the kind. You took it for granted, and observe what followed. You went to the country and obtained an overwhelming majority which, if it meant anything, meant an injunction to you to put a final end to this form of labour in South Africa, and you now come down to the House of Commons and announce that after all you intend to continue it. When you brush away all the ingenuities of the speech of the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, the plain truth comes out that there is only one justification for the decision of the Government, and that is that the facts have been too strong for them. The President of the Board of Education last night reminded us that the evil that men do lives after them; and I think that the present Cabinet is beginning to find that out. Their assertions for many months in the country have made it very difficult for them to pursue the right course. The question whether or not Chinese labour shall continue to be employed is a matter which primarily concerns not this country but South Africa. You cannot interfere with, and dictate to, a British Colony in a matter of this kind, and to put a summary end to the employment of that labour would mean, as the Under-Secretary for the Colonies has explained, the ruin of every industry in South Africa. It would mean the ruin not merely of those millionaires of Park Lane who are the object of continuous vituperation on the part of the hon. Member for Northampton and others, but of the thousands of humble persons who have invested their earnings in the country. The grounds on which the Government defend their present policy are the same as those which determined its original adoption by ourselves, but they cannot plead the same justification. Take the first ground. Take the opinion of the Transvaal itself. The hon. Member for North Camberwell says that in consulting the opinion of the Transvaal we consulted the opinion of an Assembly not elective, and therefore not properly representative of the inhabitants of that Colony. It is quite true that it was not elective, and to that extent may not have been representative, but we did take the opinion of the only authority which could in any sense be called representative which was in existence then, and we sanctioned Chinese labour because we believed from all the avenues of information which were open to us that it had the support and approval of all sections in the Colony, irrespective of race and of creed. Besides we had over and over again announced our determination to give to the Transvaal, at the earliest possible moment, a legislative assembly which would be fully representative, and stated that, whatever the decision arrived at by that assembly might be, by that decision we would be bound.

Now what is the position of the Government in regard to this matter? The Under-Secretary for the Colonies said he did not believe that the employment of Chinese labour was in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of the Transvaal. He told us that on the authority of an anonymous acquaintance whose capacity for estimating the real sentiment of the Colony we have no means of ascertaining. He then proceeded to demonstrate his confidence in the accuracy of the views of that anonymous informant by preaching a sermon to his own supporters below the gangway on the extreme danger of arbitrarily interfering with the genuine desires of the population. He then proceeded to defend the decision of the Government to maintain for a far longer time than would have been necessary had the late Government been in office, a system which, according to his own belief, has not the approval of the majority of the people of the Transvaal, by deferring for at least a year the opportunity they would have had of expressing their real opinions. And finally, in order to illustrate his conviction that the responsible Transvaal legislature when it comes into existence will finally put a veto on the employment of Chinese labour, the Under-Secretary indulged in a number of veiled menaces as to what the British Government might find themselves compelled to do if their anticipations were not realised. What value or what weight does the hon. Gentleman think is likely to be attached by the Transvaal legislature to those menaces? If it arrives at the same decision as its non-representative predecessor, if it decides to continue the employment of Chinese labour, it will be on one ground, and that is that Chinese labour is absolutely necessary to the industries of South Africa. That has always been our contention; but the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, to my great astonishment, alluding to the controversy whether Chinese labour was or was not necessary for the proper development of the industries of South Africa, airily brushed the whole question aside. He said it is not our business. He said it is not in the House of Commons that the question can be thrashed out with advantage. I quite agree with him. It cannot be thrashed out with any advantage to the Party of which he is a member. But what an astounding statement to come from the lips of one who time after time in the session gone by got up and abused His Majesty's late Government because they thought it legitimate to discuss the fiscal question on the platforms of this country, and did not think it necessary to waste night after night, to the detriment of more urgent practical business, in discussing over and over again in this House precisely the same issue which had been already discussed and disposed of in the debate on the Address. But at least the hon. Gentleman has done us this service. He has published a Blue-book which affords the most complete justification in itself for all the assertions that have been made of the absolute necessity for the employment of Chinese labour in the Transvaal. Lord Selborne, in one of these despatches (No. 39) says that unless resort was had to the outrageous expedient of forcing the natives to work the Transvaal would be hopelessly unable to satisfy its elementary requirements for unskilled labour if labourers were not imported from beyond its borders. He describes that as having been long accepted as axiomatic. It was not accepted as axiomatic during the general election. I remember that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Berwick Division told his constituents that in his opinion it would have been far better that the industrial progress and development of the Transvaal should have taken place less rapidly rather than that Chinese labour should be introduced. We have only to turn to the Blue-book to see that the employment of Chinese labour has not resulted in any excessive or abnormal expansion in the mining industry. We find that even at the present time, after the employment of 65,000 Chinese—[Cries of dissent.] Well, that is the number including those who will shortly arrive. After all, this importation of Chinese labour we find that the Witwatersrand gold mines have a less supply of coloured labour than was estimated by a majority of the Transvaal Labour Commission to be necessary for these mines in 1903. We find that now the output of gold per month for the whole of the Transvaal is only £1,799,000, while in 1899—seven years ago—the monthly production was £1,720,000. If Chinese labour had not been employed at all it is quite obvious from these facts that all the industries of the Transvaal at the present moment would have been seriously hampered, and that any progress towards recuperation would have been indefinitely delayed. And what kind of responsibility would His Majesty's late Government have taken upon themselves if, after having conducted a great war—a war which necessarily led to the infliction of a large amount of injury upon the Colony—they had made themselves responsible in the eyes of the whole population for obstructing by their veto the only method by which the ravages of the war might be wiped out and a reasonable development of the material resources of the country secured. Admitting that the labour supply on the spot was not sufficient to provide for the adequate development of the industries of the Transvaal, and that recourse must be had to some external source of supply, what external source of supply other than China has been even suggested in the course of this debate? [An HON. MEMBER: India.] I am coming to that. We find in the Blue-book that almost every part of Africa had been ransacked already to supply the local deficiency. We find in regard to the natives recruited in British Central Africa—the tropical regions of Africa—that the result had been a very heavy mortality in the mines, and before the late Government went out of office Mr. Lyttelton was forced to indicate his belief that it would be necessary to put a stop to further importation from those regions. May I address one question to the Prime Minister, or to anyone else on the Front Bench opposite who takes part in the debate. British Central Africa was until recently administered by the Foreign Office. At the time when I had knowledge of this experiment of recruiting in British Central Africa the facts were as follows. The first batch sent to the mines suffered a high percentage of mortality. We made a strict examination into the cause of that mortality, and we were informed that sufficient care had not been taken to despatch the labourers at a time of year when they would have suffered least from the change of climate. The second batch of natives did not suffer from anything like the same percentage of mortality, and all our information warranted the belief that the experiment might be continued. Something has occurred to show that these anticipations have not been realised. I should like to know from the Government whether they can promise to lay Papers which will give some indication of the reasons which have led to the failure of the experiment, and I should like also to know whether they have definitely decided that recruiting in British Central Africa shall be discontinued. Well, Kaffir labour not being susceptible of any further increase, we had India, as an hon. Member opposite has suggested. He knows very well that the Indian Government will not allow their fellow subjects to be employed in South Africa on the same terms as those on which the Chinese coolies have been introduced. Do the present Government propose to force on the Transvaal conditions which will satisfy the Indian Government? There is no hint of any such determination. [Cries of "Why not" from the MINISTERIAL Benches.] Ask your own Leader. I say, at all events, the fact that they do not intend to force on the Transvaal any such conditions justifies us in excluding India as a possible source of supply. There remains only China. Chinese have been employed, I believe, in the development of the mines of the Western States of America, employed in Canada, employed for years and years in Singapore, and the Malay Peninsula. Does the hon. Gentleman deny that?

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): In Singapore they go perfectly freely, and live and work under perfectly proper conditions.

*EARL PERCY: I am afraid that the hon. Member has forgotten that he elaborately explained to the House last night that he did not consider Chinese labour slavery because they were free to go or not as they pleased. I say that Chinese labour has been employed in all these countries without the slightest protest. All that could be urged was that before Chinese labour was employed reasonable conditions should be laid down to ensure that there should be no abuse of authority on the part of the mine-owners. Those conditions we believed we secured effectively by insisting that the contract should be explained to the coolies before leaving China, and after they arrived in South Africa, that they should receive a minimum rate of wages considerably in excess of anything they can earn in their own country, and that at any moment, if they could find the requisite money, they might return to China before the contract expired, and in any case that they must be repatriated at the expense of the employers at the conclusion of their term of engagement. Whether these conditions were or were not adequate for the protection of the Chinese labourers, at all events, we have this remarkable fact that, while we have been engaged in England for many years in a frantic agitation in the interest of the Chinese coolies, not a single word of protest has ever been raised, so far as I know, against the employment of these men or against the treatment of these men in South Africa by the Government at Pekin. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies suggested yesterday that if the Transvaal Legislature decides, a year hence, that the experiment of Chinese labour is to be continued the British Government may find it necessary to render the execution of that decision difficult by indirect influence at Pekin. What a splendid position it will be for a British Government to occupy, that they at the Court of China should represent that a British colony is the only place, and in which British colonists are the only men in whose care the lives and limbs of Chinese subjects will not be secure. I cannot say that I envy the task of the Foreign Minister who has to make that representation. The truth is that if the objections you have urged to indentured labour be wellfounded, you have no right to sanction the continuance of the experiment. What were the grounds on which you denounced Chinese labour? A good deal has been said in this debate about Chinese slavery, but very little about the competition with British labour which played so large a part in the elections. On every platform it was asserted that the Chinese labourers in South Africa were ousting the British working man. Thousands and thousands of ignorant men in this country believed that British workmen could do, and ought to do, and have done, not only skilled work, but unskilled work side by side with coloured labourers in the mines of South Africa.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): The Tory Party at the General Election in 1900 said that there was a splendid field for British working men in South Africa.

*EARL PERCY: So there is.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: You did not say that at the last General Election.

*EARL PERCY: The importation of Chinese labourers has resulted, at least, in an increase of 5,000 British skilled labourers in the mines, not to speak of other industries which are dependent more or less directly on the mining industry. I believe it was stated that when the present Government came into office they would take steps to get rid of the Chinese coolies, and substitute the British working men. We have heard nothing of that in this debate from hon. Gentlemen opposite—the Party of free-traders, forsooth, who have got into power on a protectionist cry. They do not even mention the subject now, except to suggest, as the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies did, that the proper course which the mine-owners ought to take is to adopt labour-saving machinery with the view of dispensing with the necessity of employing any more labour at all.

Then, I come to the charge of slavery. I do not know that it is necessary to discuss that question at length. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies has repudiated, not only on his own behalf, but expressly on behalf of the Government, the idea that the condition in the Transvaal of the Chinese labourers is one of slavery. To such straits has the Party opposite been reduced that they have taken refuge in a subtle distinction between servile conditions and slavery. I wonder where the hon. Member for Northampton is. [MINISTERIAL cries of "He is here."] Well, that hon. Gentleman delivered a most eloquent and witty speech the other day, in the course of which he compared to the Greek Sophists those who can see some difference between a policy of free imports and a policy of free trade, and to Socrates the Party opposite who can see no distinction at all. It may be some consolation to the modern representatives of the Sophists to remember that, however virtuous and estimable Socrates may have been, his fellow-countrymen found him such a nuisance that before very long they put him to death. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Do you justify that?"] I wonder what Socrates — the man of all others in Greece who never sold the truth to serve the hour — would have said of a Party which used the word "Slavery" in order to get into power, and rather than apologise to those whom they had slandered, took refuge in this wretched, paltry, verbal quibble between slavery and servile conditions! The hon. Member for North Camberwell got up the other day and said that he had used the word "Slavery" on the platform in the country during the election; and asked the front Ministerial Bench why they had not the courage to repeat it here. There are two reasons why his leaders on the Front Bench do not follow his example. The hon. Member is quite honest in still describing the conditions af Chinese labour as slavery. Is he equally logical in holding that the coolie is a slave, and therefore presumably yearning to have the opportunity of getting out of South Africa and returning to his native land, while at the same time he urges His Majesty's Government to cancel the clause in the Ordinance which permits the coolie to re-engage? But there is another reason why the Front Bench opposite does not endorse the charge of slavery. It is because they do not believe it. Lord Ripon said so in the House of Lords the other day. This Cabinet evidently does not recognise the doctrine of collective responsibility. The Foreign Secretary and the Secretary of State for War repudiated the term even during the General Election. Lord Crewe said—

> "Not only is the phrase inaccurate, but the people who have used it knew that it was inaccurate."

He said that it is a descriptive term, and apparently the Gentlemen who used it did not mean to do anything wrong. Their only difficulty was the poverty of their language. They could not find words to express their meaning. It must have been painful to the Under Secretary for the Colonies, who went down to Manchester a very short time before the General Election, and held up the present Cabinet to admiration as a galaxy of literary talent, to be driven last night to describe the oratorical efforts of the President of the Board of Education, the President of the Local Government Board, and the President of the Board of Trade, as "terminological inexactitudes." But the chief offender in this matter is the Prime Minister himself. I do not know whether he still believes that Chinese labour is slavery or that there is a logical distinction between slavery and servile conditions.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What does the noble Lord mean by asking me if I still believe in the distinction between servile conditions and slavery?

*EARL PERCY: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that he never believed it?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes. I have spoken of it in two phrases. I have said that it was tainted with slavery and I repeat that. I have said that it had many of the characteristics of slavery, and I repeat that. Beyond that I have never gone.

*EARL PERCY: I doubt whether the same effect would have been produced in the constituencies if all the Prime Minister's supporters had used the same language. At all events he does not believe that it is slavery; but he does believe that it is tainted with slavery. He does believe that the conditions are servile conditions. And why? His objections do not relate to the outrages which have occurred. Many of the outrages alleged to have been perpetrated on the Chinese labourers on the Rand have been grossly exaggerated. They were reported on the authority of men who had already returned to China, and those persons who made themselves responsible for these accusations, instead of taking the logical step of bringing them under the notice of the authorities, adopted the course of sending them home to newspapers in England in order that Party capital might be made out of them here. In any case effective steps had been taken to prevent a repetition of such occurrences before the present Government came into office. The right hon. Gentleman has told us why he considers Chinese labour servile labour. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham asked the Prime Minister whether the Chinese labourer was not as free as he was. The Prime Minister said—

> 'Of course he was not. He is confined to the compounds. He is not allowed to engage in business or trade, and not allowed to

settle in the country after the termination of his contract."

These are the conditions which, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, constitute servile conditions.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Some of them.

*Earl PERCY: But if these are servile conditions they ought at once to be removed. The right hon. Gentleman had a most remarkable theory of the responsibility of the Imperial Government in this matter. He says that they are not responsible for the employment of Chinese labour.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not for the introduction of the Chinese labourers.

*Earl PERCY: Are they not responsible for the continued employment of the Chinese labourers?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Thanks to the noble Lord and his friends we may not be able to help it.

*Earl PERCY: At all events the right hon. Gentleman thinks that there is a responsibility resting on the present Government in regard to the employment of the Chinese in the mines. I understand that he draws a distinction between responsibility for the employment of the Chinese labourers and responsibility for the conditions under which they are employed. I disagree with him. He is responsible for the continuance of this experiment until the Transvaal Legislature has an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it, and that opportunity has been deferred by the action of His Majesty's Government. The Government will be equally responsible, when the Transvaal has expressed its opinions, for advising His Majesty to approve or withhold His sanction from any Ordinance which it may propose. Besides, according to the Under-Secretary, none of the conditions which the Prime Minister mentioned on the Address as being the most objectionable are to be altered. The right hon. Gentleman was asked if the Chinese coolies were still to be confined in compounds and he said—

"Oh, yes; of course, if South Africa will not have them running about, they must be shut up."

These Chinese coolies are not to be allowed to engage in any trade or business, and so far from displaying any solicitude that they should remain in the country when they have completed their term of service, the only change the Government are making is to accelerate their return to China. I should like to make one or two remarks with regard to this policy of repatriation. In the first place as to the facts the Prime Minister on the Address and the Under-Secretary yesterday told us that the Imperial Parliament were to be liable for the expenses necessary to send the coolie back to China, but I observe that in his telegram Lord Elgin only suggested that the Imperial Government should be responsible for the balance of expenses which could not be contributed by the coolie himself. I should like to know which is correct. Is the coolie to be repatriated at the sole expense of the Exchequer or is some contribution to be expected from him? So far as the principle of repatriation is concerned, I do not think we need raise much objection to it. On the contrary, I agree with the High Commissioner that it will prove a most valuable test of the truth of the statements which have been made. We shall see how many of these Chinese coolies want to be repatriated. The hon. Member for North Camberwell thinks that the number will be very small, and I imagine the Government share his view, because the Under-Secretary gave as a reason for not cancelling the contracts with the 3,000 coolies who were about to arrive in South Africa, that to do so would involve a very great expense upon the Government. It is, it seems, too great an expense to prevent a coolie from coming from China at all, but the expense of repatriating those Chinese now in South Africa who desire to return to their native country is so small that the British taxpayers are not likely to raise any objection.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The charges to which this country might be put on repatriation are strictly limited to £17 10s. per man. The charges of compensation to which we might have been put had we refused to allow the contracts already entered into to be carried through would have been of an indefinite character and would very likely have amounted to three or four millions of money.

*EARL PERCY: I should rather like to see an estimate of the comparative cost of the two experiments, but at all events if any very large proportion of the coolies wish to be repatriated at the expense of the Treasury, the expense, even on the calculation of the hon. Member, would be very considerable indeed.

*MR. CHURCHILL: Three quarters of a million.

*EARL PERCY: Is it really necessary to make this special provision? The hon. Gentleman told us yesterday that it cost £17 10s. per man, and that it would take the Chinese coolie two and a half years to amass the requisite sum. But we learn that no less than 1,900 have managed to accumulate the necessary sum and have returned to China. One difficulty of the Government scheme is that of preventing fraud.

*MR. CHURCHILL: What kind of fraud?

*EARL PERCY: Misrepresentation. How are you going to ascertain the *bona fides* of those who wish to emigrate? How are you going to prevent what has already occurred, and ensure that those who go back at the expense of the State do not subsequently come out again? There is another difficulty, and it is that of discriminating between the case of the Chinese coolie and that of the coolie who is recruited from other sources. On what ground are you going to allow the Chinese coolie to be repatriated at the expense of the taxpayers here and to withhold the same privilege from the coolie from British Central Africa? No doubt the greatest practical difficulty has been removed—that of obtaining the consent of the Transvaal Legislature, which, as Lord Selborne says, would almost certainly be withheld, by charging the expense to the Imperial Exchequer. But I do not think the Government have evaded two other very serious problems. If we turn to page 63 of the Blue-book we find Lord Selborne says—

> "It can hardly be repeated too often that the existing industrial organisation, to say nothing of the existing machinery of Government of the Transvaal, could not be justified if the position of the gold mining industry, at the highest point to which it has hitherto attained, is to be taken as its permanent high-water mark. The existing industrial orgonization and the existing machinery of Government, can only be justified by the anticipation of a steady and reasonable expansion of the industry."

That is to say, the existing scale of administrative expenditure in the Transvaal is not justified unless you are going to allow free play to the mining industry to secure the labour which it requires for its development. You will be placed in a very difficult position if the Transvaal Legislature says, "You have seriously diminished our resources, but you insist upon our keeping up a machinery of government which is not warranted by the revenue at our disposal, and under these circumstances we do not think you can legitimately call upon us to at once repay the thirty millions debt which we owe." Then, again, the hon. Gentleman said with regard to the licenses already issued that the Government had plighted their faith, but I submit that the moral obligation of the Government goes further and that, although they had a perfect right on their own responsibility to suspend further recruitment, they have no right to prevent employers from making good the wastage by disease or through desertion in the number of labourers originally sanctioned. That obligation becomes the more strong when you are actually holding out to the coolies an inducement to break their contracts. If what the Government are doing had been done by any private individual I should imagine that he would lay himself open to prosecution for incitement to breach of contract. Two years ago Lord Rosebery gave two pieces of very sensible advice which I am afraid have not been much heeded by the Party opposite. He advised them to make their position clear to the electors of the country on the question of Home Rule. They followed that advice by exhorting one another during the election to say as little as possible about what they intended to do with their majority for fear they might not get a majority at all. They went about saying that Home Rule was a "bogey." ["No!"] I say they did; they went about saying that no real advance could be made in the direction of Home Rule without another appeal to the country. ["No!"] Yes, the Foreign Secretary said so expressly to his constituents.

*MR. SPEAKER: It does not seem advisable to raise the Home Rule question upon this Amendment.

*EARL PERCY: I did not intend to pursue that subject, I only wanted to point out one respect in which Lord Rosebery's advice had not been followed. The second piece of advice was that they should clear themselves of the suspicion which prevailed in many parts of the Empire that they were indifferent to its interests. I should never have made that assertion myself, but it has been made by one who has held the high office of Foreign Minister under a Liberal Government; and I do think it is a great pity that they should have lent colour to such a suspicion by their tactics at the election and the light-hearted manner in which they have interfered with one third of the labour supply of a great colony. Lord Rosebery also made a suggestion with which I am going to identify myself. He recommended them two years ago if they were so fortunate as to come into office to at once appoint a Commission of Inquiry to go out to South Africa and study the facts. I wish to make an earnest appeal to the Government to assent to our request that such a Commission should be appointed. Lord Selborne has expressed himself strongly in favour of such a Commission. He asked for it several months ago. The Prime Minister himself has shown that it is necessary by saying in the debate on the Address that he and his colleagues were woefully in need of information. It would in my opinion have been far better if that Commission had been appointed before Lord Elgin attempted to do what I should have thought his own law officers would have been able to tell him was illegal—before the President of the Board of Trade had gone about the country accusing the late Government of action in connection with signing contracts for which they had no responsibility whatever. But at all events there is every reason why the Government should assent to the appointment of such a Commission now. They have obtained their power by the use of fiction and it is high time they should take means to ascertain the facts upon which alone a judicious use of that power can be based. I say, therefore, from the point of view of their own interests, the appointment of such a Commission is eminently to be desired. Apart from that, I say we have a right to claim it as an act of justice. The responsible advisers of His Majesty's Government have been grossly slandered by statements made in the country, and the honour of British colonists has been impugned. Both have a right to demand that these accusations shall be tested and that the full facts shall be placed before the country so that it may be able to form a judgment. There is an old proverb, "That all is fair in love and war. I do not pose as an expert in regard to the first, but as regards war the theory has long been discarded in the practice of civilised countries. Apparently Party warfare in this country is not yet regulated on the principles of the Hague Convention. We have still to put up with the use—may I so describe them—of methods of barbarism—the poisoning of the wells of truth. But such methods are apt to recoil on the heads of those who resort to them. You have won a great electoral campaign, but in doing so I believe you have inflicted serious damage on the reputation of a great Party, you have materially diminished the power of your Foreign Minister to make effective representations to foreign countries in the interests of subject races whose treatment, in your opinion, is not in accordance with the dictates of humanity, and you have provoked a feeling of resentment and indignation in the hearts of thousands of your own fellow countrymen in the colonies, which, unless you offer them the reasonable reparation I suggest may, in the long run, lose you South Africa.

*MR. MOND (Chester) apologised as a new Member for intervening in so important a debate, but explained that he should not have done so had it not been for the remarks which had fallen from the noble Lord who sat down just previous to the adjournment, and who suggested that it was physically impossible for white men to work in the South African mines. A good deal was said during the elections about the possibility of using white labour if the Chinese had been excluded from South Africa, but nothing had been said on the subject of this debate. He had, to the best of his ability, studied this question, and had sent five of his constituents to South Africa to work in the mines in the Barberton district, where the work upon which they had been engaged was similar in character to that done by the Chinese and the Kaffirs, and which would in fact have been done by Kaffirs had not these men been there to do it. He very readily admitted that it would be absurd to draw a definite deduction from such an experiment as that, but when hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House had been continually and unjustly and unfairly charged with misrepresentation, it was only fair to ask how many times had hon. Members opposite, both from their places in the House and on platforms outside, asserted that unskilled white labour could not and would not be employed in South Africa. And when he found in the Blue-book the statement that the number of unskilled white men employed in the mines in the Witwatersrand mines upon work which before the War was performed by Kaffirs was 772, he wondered how hon. Members opposite could, over and over again, have repeated the statement that it was physically impossible for white men to do work in South Africa similar to that which white men were doing in every other mining field in the world. That statement had been continually made by hon Gentlemen opposite, and that had as much to do with the elections of hon. Gentlemen opposite as the elections of supporters of the Government. One thing the British working man would always resent was the imputation that he could not do the work which Chinese coolies could perform. What was the object of these representations? He had men assisting him in his election who had been in South Africa and who had come home because the Chinese had come into that country, and they told their fellow workmen the real facts. To pretend, as hon. Members did, that those who sat on the Ministerial side of the House could go out among the British electorate and by misrepresentations sweep away the position of hon. Members opposite was an insult to the intelligence of the people. He was sorry Mr. Balfour was not in the House at the present time. Mr. Balfour was cross-examined day by day at East Manchester during the election by the working men of that constituency, not upon academic subjects, but upon the facts of this Ordinance, and they told him what they thought of him. He had turned up the word "slavery" in the Encyclopædia Britannica and had found twenty-five different definitions of "slavery." When hon. Gentlemen opposite said that men could not go willingly into slavery he might remind them that in ancient Germany free men gambled themselves, their wives and families, into slavery. He had asserted that this Ordinance was slavery, whatever hon. Gentlemen might say to him. He must say these philological arguments were unworthy of this Assembly.

Everybody knew what this Amendment meant. It meant that the Party opposite were exceeding sore that they had not won the election. That was the beginning and the end of their complaint. Like a lot of children they came and complained because they had lost. Were there not posters on both sides to which exception could be taken? He asked the hon. and learned Member for the City whether he approved of the posters at the previous election. In his constituency there was a big poster displaying the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Roberts, in full uniform on a horse with a drawn sword, and directing the electors to vote for the Tory candidate who opposed him. There was a similar picture of Lord Kitchener of Khartoum. He would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite whether that was fair electioneering—whether there was any right to drag the names of our great generals and army into electioneering? He did not complain. It was all in a day's work, but it was absurd for the Opposition, who had with them the

Peerage and Beerage and all the influences the country could command, to come and present themselves to the House and the country as poor people who had lost an election through posters. Why were they making themselves so cheap in the eyes of the country? It was an endeavour to entrap the young Members on the Government side of the House to vote against their own Leaders at the invitation of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. If he knew who were leaders on the other side, it might be easier to follow them; but he did not know whether they had yet settled their differences amongst themselves. There was one thing he was certain of, and that was that his constituency sent him to the House because he was not a follower of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, and that they sent him to the House to follow the Prime Minister in the policy he was pursuing. During the election, the Prime Minister did him the honour of speaking for him, and he defined the Chinese policy as free Chinese or none at all. That satisfied his constituents, and he was quite satisfied to leave the settlement of this question to the wise and ripe judgment of his leaders. No man in this country had devoted more time and consideration to this matter, and nothing would make him support the right hon. Gentlemen opposite who brought about the very evil they were now discussing. He was very pleased to see during the election that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham said that he had always disliked Chinese labour, and that if he had remained at the Colonial Office he should never have allowed it to be introduced until the responsible opinion of the Transvaal people had been taken. Why did he not say that a little earlier, and insist on its acceptance by the Unionist Party whom he had made swallow his fiscal programme? They could surely have met him on a little point like that, and then one-half of the objections would have been removed. This Chinese labour had been introduced against the express wish of the larger part of the population, for he did not accept the Chamber of Mines or the mine magnates as representing the people of the colony. Every executive of every union of white labouring men in the Transvaal had from the beginning passed resolutions condemning the introduction of Chinese labour.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): What about the free churches?

*MR. MOND said he was not dealing with that. On questions of labour he liked the opinion of labour men. As free church evidence they were given the opinion of a man, who, he found, was one of the largest purveyors of goods to the Rand mines. As regarded Mr. Boland's allegations, it was said, why did he not do this and that? But Mr. Boland was not a judicial authority, or a representative of the Government. He had no authority to inquire into the matter, and, from what he (Mr. Mond) had heard from people who had tried to inquire into this question at Johannesburg, it was an extremely difficult thing to get any information there. When the noble Lord quoted a Blue-book as if it contained inspired words and expected them to accept all Lord Selborne's despatches, which were the mere echo of the Chamber of Mines, he would ask, was that conclusive to those who had spent years trying to find out the truth? One of the most serious accusations against the late Government was that they made themselves the mouthpiece of the Chamber of Mines. Why did they not send out the Royal Commission which they now wanted the present Government to appoint? He would like to put a question to the hon. Member for Gravesend. Would he go to Canada and advocate there the immigration of a single yellow man? Would he go to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and put that proposition before him? British Columbia excluded yellow men, and so did Australia and New Zealand. The noble Lord said that we should alienate the support of the Colonies, and by that he meant a hundred thousand people in Johannesburg. But nothing of the kind would happen. These people in Johannesburg were as anxious as anyone here to get rid of the "yellow terror." It was a few people in Park Lane and on the Stock Exchange who might be alienated. The danger was that what had been done would alienate from us the sympathy of our great self-governing colonies. The Unionist Party was fond of shouting on the platform about the Empire, but never for a moment thought of the result of their action.

They talked about posters, but did they ever see worse posters than those of the Tariff Reform League? One showed the Prime Minister welcoming a lot of dirty foreigners, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer warning off British workmen. That was a fine truthful statement of fact, was it not? He wondered whether the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for West Birmingham would take the responsibility for every poster and pamphlet issued by the Tariff Reform League. He had no doubt he would absolutely refuse to do anything so foolish, and very wisely, too. In his constituency there was a poster put up, in which the Prime Minister was depicted as a columbine dressed in a beautiful pair of tights and frills. Was it supposed that if the other Party had won the election the Liberals would have insisted upon an apology for having misled the people of this country into believing that their Leader belonged to the "Follies" of the seaside performers. Did hon. Gentlemen opposite approve of turning into ridicule those who might, for the moment at any rate, be His Majesty's responsible Ministers? Party politics at an election ran high; there had been inaccuracies on both sides, and the sooner they were forgotten and the less said about them the better. If the right hon. Gentlemen opposite at the next election would appoint a Committee consisting of the hon. and learned Member for the City and the hon. Member for East Marylebone and two hon. Members on the Government side to revise all posters and all speeches which were to be made by any Minister, ex-Minister, or other candidates, before delivery, then perhaps they would reach that high classic ideal, which no doubt the hon. Member for Marylebone so heartily desired, in the rough and tumble of elections. But when they were beaten, let them not come to this House and complain. After nearly twenty years of uninterrupted office surely they should not grudge the Liberals a little time on the Government side of the House, and surely the time of this House might be better occupied than in discussing dead issues—the deadest of all issues: election literature. The day after the election no one looked at it on the walls, but wondered why anyone ever put it there. As a matter of fact, he did not believe anyone ever looked at a poster, and he believed they all wasted their money. What people looked at to-day in politics were facts, not posters. The facts were sufficiently apparent to the working men of this country who felt deceived and rightly deceived. If the other side had gone before them frankly and told them what they were going to do, they would have had nothing to say; but they did not do it. They had played with them and deluded them—at any rate, the people thought they had. He did not say the Unionists had done it intentionally; he had never aspersed their personal character. It was the policy that he and his friends had aspersed. And working men of this country felt that they had been deluded, and that the introduction of Chinese labour into South Africa was an intolerable insult to them, their manhood, and the labour of the world, and that the dignity of labour was involved. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had yet a lot to learn about the labour question. It was not that the British working man wanted to go to South Africa for work. The cotton operatives of Lancashire did not want to go and work in the mines, so that their attitude was not due to any feeling of jealousy. But they regarded this form of Chinese labour as absolutely fundamentally opposed to any principle of the Labour Party in this country. He saw a report in the *Transvaal Leader* of the 26th January regarding some dispute about wages at "Jumper's Deep." The water supply was in consequence cut off from the compound, and the inhabitants were given no food for two days; and, after that, the men naturally consented to work again. Did they call that slavery? Oh, no; that was freedom! Misconceptions existed on this subject. Some hon. Gentlemen on the other side told them that these contracts were made under the Chinese flag, and therefore would be legal, though they were illegal under the British flag. But, on the compounds in China, the Union Jack was hoisted, and it was under that flag that the labour was enlisted. Had Members of the Cabinet ever instituted an inquiry as to how these people were being recruited? From the opinions he had received from private sources it would seem that many of the horrors of the old slave traffic had been revived. He understood that some of the native agents went up country 300 or 400 miles, and by various methods induced a man down to the coasts where it was quite true the terms of the ordinance were then read to him. And if the Chinaman said he did not like it he was told he could go back. But he had no means to go back that distance. And so he unwillingly signed the contract.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not a fact.

*MR. MOND said he was informed by people who had been out there and had seen the thing done. He would like to know whether it was a fact that in Hong Kong about two years ago the British police found a manacled man in the streets with his legs broken. They discovered that he came from a house full of manacled men who were waiting to be taken down to a ship to be sent to South Africa. [Cries of "Oh"!] He was told that, not by a member of the Liberal Party, but by a gentleman who resided in China for thirty years. He did not say it was true, but had the late Government ever made any inquiry into it?

*EARL PERCY asked if steps were taken to bring the matter under the notice of the late Government.

*MR. MOND said he believed such steps were taken and that the matter stopped there. It was discovered by the British police at Hong Kong, and reported to the British Governor, and put an end to. He would put to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who was as desirous of the good reputation of the Empire as any one in the House, whether a condition of things which produced matters of that kind in China, and, on the evidence of Lord Selborne, cruelty and flogging in South Africa, was a system they were proud of in the face of the world, of their colonial brothers, and of their American cousins. In 1833 the House of Commons passed a resolution abolishing slavery and voted £15,000,000. In 1835 the Jamaica legislature passed an Ordinance in which they introduced apprenticed labour for seven years, at the end of which the whole system came to an end. What was the Government intending to do? From all he had heard from the speeches on his side they were following the precedent of 1833 in the case of the West Indies. They were not suddenly cutting the Gordian knot, but slowly dissolving it. It was absurd to taunt the Government for not taking more immediate steps. To suddenly take away from the industry a very large number of people would be very unfair, but by gradually taking them away the man of business could accommodate himself to the new conditions. He would point out that in 1898, when there was not a single Chinaman on the Rand, before the disastrous war, those poor miserable people the mine owners paid dividends amounting to £4,800,000. They had as many Kaffirs now as they had then, and they could get many more Kaffirs if they wanted, and if they could not get them they would have to do without them, like other employers of labour in other parts of the world. The persons who were interested in that industry which could, without any Chinese, pay the large dividends he had mentioned, came to this House *in forma pauperis* to plead to the British nation that unless they were allowed to have 150,000 Chinese coolies in South Africa they must all go into the workhouse. That was carrying it a little too far. He had no quarrel with those gentlemen and did not abuse them. It was their business to make money, but it was the business of this House to govern the Empire. In twenty to sixty years the gold would be exhausted probably in the Transvaal, and that country would then revert to agriculture, which had been there for hundreds of years and would be there for hundreds of years to come. Was not the proper policy then to see that the gold mines there, as they had been in Australia end California, were the means of attracting a white population which would spread out from the mines on to the land and enable us truly to hold the Colony we had made such efforts to acquire?

It was the Imperial aspect that had always appealed to him most strongly, and he was prepared even to pay subsidies in order to keep a white population. Why did they not give back that £30,000,000 which this country had no right to accept, and which the Transvaal ought not to be called upon to pay. [AN HON. MEMBER: But we have not got it yet.] No, and he did no tthink they ever would get it. This country never had any right to that money, and it was only owing to the persuasive tongue of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who could always get £30,000,000 out of anybody if he tried, that this money was promised. By a clever manœuvre of the right hon. Gentleman an attempt was being made to inveigle and lure them into the same lobby, and he was glad that that attempt would entirely fail in its object. Upon this occasion hon. Members above and below the gangway, and a great many hon. Members opposite, he was sure, would support their leader, who, after so much effort they had placed in his present proud position in order to cleanse the Augean stable which the late Government had left behind. It seemed to him to be a novel constitutional doctrine that the Ministry of the time were to be bound by whatever a candidate at the election chose to say, or by any poster which a candidate liked to put out, and, if they did not carry out that policy, were to be hurled from power. The time would come when right hon. Gentlemen opposite would again appeal to the country, and he asked them to remember this collective responsibility, and then they would be able to see which was the boa constrictor and which was the rabbit. He should vote against this Amendment.

*MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said he desired to place before the House the views of the organised Labour Party on this subject. Working men did not care what description was given to Chinese labour. They considered that when a man was not free from day to day, but was hired for a certain definite time to an employer, and was not free to make any alteration in that arrangement whenever he thought necessary, it was, by whatever name it might be called, slavery. The British Navy was an entirely different thing. Indeed it was odious to compare either branch of the service with Chinese labour as it existed in South Africa. As a man who had worked not only in Britain but in other parts of the Empire and even among the coolies—he meant the Indian coolies—he held there was no work under the sun that the British workman could not do. It was entirely a question of whether or not he could get sufficient wages for it. It was a serious reflection on the British working man to suggest that there was any kind of work he could not do. Even in this country there was work done by Britishers which was very irksome and degrading, and they would like considerably more of it done by other means if it were possible. To suggest that it was necessary to take any kind of labour into the mines other than British because Britishers could not do the work was untrue. It might be true that they would want certain regulations. It might be that they would require in the Transvaal a decent Mines Regulation Act. It might be that they would want a hundred and one other things that the British working man generally took with him, such as his trade organisations and such regulations as would enable him to perform the work with decency and comfort. It was really because they wanted these things that objection was taken to their going to South Africa. One felt inclined, even in 1906, to ask, in the words of Southey—

"Now tell us all about the war,
And what they killed each other for."

He had listened to the debates for several years from a more elevated position than he occupied to-day. At last he was glad he had an opportunity of stating on the floor his views on this very important question.

From the beginning the organised workmen of the country had declared that the war was not for the franchise, nor for any of the things ostensibly put forward to justify the country engaging in it, but was really a wage-and-labour question. As early as December, 1899, the whole of the trades union leaders of the country, and others favourable to their views, decided to put forward a statement on the subject, and he desired to quote from it, because at that time it was impossible to get a clear statement of what the war was for. In that leaflet the Labour leaders said—

> "You will naturally exclaim that there must be some real object for the war. Yes; there was. It is a war waged by capitalists with the object of obtaining greater profits through cheap labour."

Was that untrue? There was no answer. The leaflet proceeded—

> "A meeting of the Consolidated Goldfields Mining Company of South Africa was held at the Cannon Street Hotel on November 14th, 1899."

That was only a few days or weeks after the war had begun. They could get an idea from this what it was that those who engineered the war were really driving at. The following statement appeared in the *Financial News* of November 21st, 1899—

> "Lord Harris, the chairman, said that upon the working of the mines, with a capital of £2,147,000, the profit for the year had been £1,006,000."

This enormous profit did not seem to satisfy them. They wanted more, and they meant to have it. Mr. Hammond, an engineer of the company, made this remarkable statement:—

> "With a good Government there should be an abundance of labour, and with an abundance of labour there would be no difficulty in cutting down wages."

He asked them candidly, and especially those on his side of the House, was that not almost positive proof that those gentlemen most implicated in South African finance knew what they were aiming at. Then a Mr. D. Rudd, a director, said that if they could only get one half of the natives to work three months of the year, it would work wonders, and they should try some cogent form of inducement to compel them to work, by taxation, or in some other way, and make them contribute their quota to the good of the community. He had never heard that Mr. Rudd was particularly fond of work himself, but he would not follow up that argument any further. Mr. Cecil Rhodes, as long ago as 1894, made a speech in which he said that if they could make these people work, they would reduce the rates of labour in the country. That was exactly their contention, namely that Chinese labour was not introduced because white labour or Kaffirs could not, under proper conditions, do the work, or even because there was not a sufficient number of Kaffirs. There were other quotations he could read dealing with that point, showing that this was not a question of the scarcity of labour, but merely a question of reducing the pay of the men, and increasing the profits of the company. He knew that some of his friends dubbed him a Little Englander, but in reply to that he would say that he had done for his country what some of them had not had the courage to do; he had risked his life for the Empire, and he thought there would be less talk about Little Englanders if those gentlemen who applied that term to him would do the same. Did they imagine for one moment that the mothers of England, when they saw their sons off to the war in those dark years of 1899 and 1900, thought they were sending them to leave their bones in that country in order to support and maintain and introduce a policy such as they were defending to-day in this House? He was positive that they thought nothing of the kind. The flag had been introduced into this election. Well, he had marched under the British flag, but he had given instructions to his election agents that that flag was not to be used in his election, because he looked upon the flag as an emblem of the unity and character of the nation, and it did not belong to any one section. What they wanted on this occasion was for the House to take a sensible view, if it could. He made that observation because the Resolution was drafted in such a way that whilst everyone against slavery could support the first part of it, it was difficult for the moment, in view of the position of the Government in the matter, to support the second part of the Amendment. Therefore, he should oppose in every shape and form the first part of the Amendment, and he should go into the lobby in support of the Government which the country had placed in power by such an overwhelming majority, composed of the different sections of democratic thought, to put an end to this business at the first available opportunity. That was the position, as near as he could judge, of the Labour Party. They did not wish to hamper the Administration, but they wished the Government to understand that they did not agree to this business of Chinese labour being handed on *ad infinitum*. They would give the

Administration a chance of dealing with it, but he hoped that before this Parliament came to an end Chinese labour would no longer be part of the policy of the British Empire.

*MR. DUNN (Cornwall, Camborne) said he was quite sure that hon. Members of the House would pardon the audacity of a new Member, and not only did he ask for their pardon, but he also asked for their forbearance. It was always difficult for a new Member to speak in august Assembly, but it was even more difficult when that new Member had to follow a Gentleman so well versed and eloquent as the hon. Member who had just addressed the House. He should not have spoken on this occasion had it not been for a speech delivered yesterday by the hon. and learned Member for the City of London. He came to this House and told them that there was one place in this England of ours, one constituency, where the whole facts of Chinese labour were known, and that that constituency was the City of London. He was prepared to concede to the hon. and learned Member that upon this question he spoke with due authority as representing the capitalists and the financial interests of persons who knew the truth about this Chinese Labour Ordinance. There was another constituency not, perhaps, so important, but it was in the Far West, and it was a constituency that likewise knew something about Chinese labour. Whilst listening to this debate, he had wished that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon could only have spoken in the Camborne constituency instead of in this House. If this building were empty, and it were possible to bring the men here, he could fill it with electors of his mining division who were workers in the Transvaal mines. After that, he would have no difficulty at all in filling the building a second time, for no less than 1,400 men who were electors in his constituency were working in the mines of the Transvaal at the present time. But that did not end the connection of his constituency with this question. There were in the Camborne Division men who had returned from the Transvaal, and who knew perfectly well the whole of the facts connected with Chinese labour there. The hon. and learned Member for the City of London had stated that those financial gentlemen who were electors in his constituency, knowing everything about the position, voted for him, and did so because they knew he was in favour of the Chinese Labour Ordinance.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE: I did not say that. What I said was that it was scarcely mentioned in the course of my election campaign.

*MR. DUNN said he understood that the hon. and learned Member stated that his constituency knew all about it, and knew his views upon Chinese labour, and that in consequence they had elected him by a large majority.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE: Those statements are perfectly correct, but I do not think that they returned me in consequence of my views upon any particular subject.

*MR. DUNN said if the hon. Member had any doubt as to his election he had no doubt himself as to why he was returned for Camborne. He put in his election address that he was strenuously opposed to Chinese labour on the Rand, and he was returned by a majority of two to one. Every Saturday night there was spent in the town of Camborne more money which was earned in the Rand mines than was earned in any other way. Therefore, he thought he was justified in saying, with a certain amount of authority, that his constituents knew something about this Chinese Ordinance. What did the miners themselves say about this matter? He had had the privilege of speaking to many hundreds of them during the last few months, and they did not try to draw any nice distinctions between servile labour and slavery. If they had been asked for a definition he did not think they would have been able to give it, but they had told him that Chinese labour had been introduced into the mines under remarkable circumstances and subjected to extraordinary conditions. He did therefore think it was unfortunate that they should be engaged in the House of Commons discussing such fine distinctions. Surely it was bad even if they had approached the line of demarcation. They might even have crossed it, but whether that was so or not, they were certainly too near to it to be pleasant.

Surely a slave might be well treated, well clothed, and well fed, and yet remain a slave. A man might be badly treated, and starved almost, and yet be practically a free man. Probably the best way to see where the line came was to observe how the system affected third persons. He dared say there might be hon. Members in this House who read about twelve months ago a paragraph in the Press dealing with what was going on, not in South Africa, but in another Colony, namely, Hong Kong. From that paragraph it seemed that some Chinamen were enlisting to work in South Africa, and that a countryman was asking them not to do it. He told his comrades that it would be unwise of them to enlist. That man was taken before a magistrate in the Colony. He was not fined, nor was he sent to prison, but he was told that he must not do it again. They had heard a great deal about the enlistment being a perfectly voluntary act. An hon. Member who took part in the debate yesterday stated that there were men engaged in the mines who had committed a large number of murders. He wondered under what conditions these men enlisted. They knew that the Chinese official had peculiar methods. He wondered whether the choice was given to those men to leave the country or to suffer a peculiar and unsatisfactory Chinese execution. Hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House had been challenged to prophesy how many coolies would return to China under the concession His Majesty's Ministers were making. He wondered how many dare return. The great objection of the working miner to this ordinance arose from the fact that they had never yet got a satisfactory answer to the question, Why have Chinese been introduced? He knew they were told that there was a shortage of black labour, but how did that shortage arise? They had heard something with regard to the Commission. They knew how the Commission was formed, and that after taking evidence they recommended that it was necessary in their opinion that Chinese should be introduced to the Rand. The constitution of that Commission was well known. It was also well known that there were three classes of witnesses who were called, or might have been called before the Commission. One class of witnesses so called were the mine magnates themselves and their officials. Another class of witnesses called before the Commission were the representatives of the native races, every one of whom declared that in his opinion it was not necessary to introduce Chinese labour, because if proper methods were taken there would be plenty of black labour. But there was a class not called to give evidence, and that class were the working men of the trade unions. There were trade unions even in South Africa, but not one official of any trade union in South Africa was asked to give evidence before the Commission or give an opinion on the point. Was it any wonder, having regard to the composition of the Commission, and having regard to the kind of evidence which was called, that there was the recommendation to which he referred. Had they forgotten a meeting held at Cape Town at a time when our soldiers were busily engaged in fighting battles in the Transvaal? The mining magnates at that conference dealt with the question of skilled labour, and expressed a desire to do away with machine rock drilling. He would say that there might be difficulty in the whites doing the whole of the unskilled labour in the mines, but they did know that many thousands of whites at the time the Ordinance was passed were doing unskilled labour. With regard to skilled labour it was felt that Chinamen had been introduced practically for the purpose of doing that labour. He knew that hon. Members would say that conditions were laid down which would prevent their doing skilled labour, but at the present moment certain work which had always been regarded as skilled work was being done by these Chinese coolies on the Rand. One of the chief kinds of work in which white labour was employed was the working of the drilling machines, and the mine owners had determined to reduce machine drills in the mines. He had before him a speech which was delivered only twelve months ago by the chairman of a Rand gold mine. In that speech it was stated that when the Chinese had become thoroughly efficient it was the intention of the management to resort more and more to hand drilling. Then, again, later in the speech it was stated that the introduction of Chinese labour had been good for white labour, good for black labour, and good for the gold industry. Those were very important words, and he thought that if they read carefully the speeches which had been delivered from time to time by mine managers and mine directors they would see that the great object in introducing Chinese coolies on the Rand was to oust the skilled white labourers, and finally to make the coolies do the skilled work. The Kaffir would always be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, but the Chinaman was a very different man. The Chinaman was a skilled mechanic; that was why he was wanted in South Africa, and unless something was done to put an end to this they would surely find that the Chinaman who was to-day, he admitted, for the most part doing unskilled work, would shortly be employed at skilled work.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): I should feel myself very well content to leave the case presented to the House on behalf of His Majesty's Government as it was left in the most able and admirable speech of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies yesterday. But as I find that some amount of misapprehension still appears to prevail in some quarters as to the real intentions and policy of the Government, I think it right at this stage of the debate to trespass for a few moments on the attention of the House, in order to restate our position in language which I hope will be free from any possibility either of ambiguity or misconstruction. I shall not re-embark upon, because I confess I am not much moved by, a controversy, which seems to me largely a verbal one, as to whether the term "slavery"—a term which this Amendment quite untruly declares has been applied by His Majesty's Ministers—is or is not the most accurate and appropriate description of what has been going on in the Transvaal. So far as I am personally concerned, I told my constituents, both before and at the time of the general election, that I have never applied the term in that connection, profoundly and unconquerably opposed as I have been and am to the whole of this most unhappy experiment. But it is not a question of language. The noble Lord the Member for South Kensington, earlier this afternoon made merry over the distinction between slavery and servile conditions. Unfortunately in this world you cannot classify everything into two categories—it would be much more convenient if you could—the one black and the other white. Has the noble Lord ever heard, in the course of his researches into South African history, of the Convention of 1881, under which we established our relations with the South African Republic, to which we had then regranted its independence? If he has forgotten them, let me remind him of the words of one of the articles—

> "No slavery, or apprenticeship partaking of the nature of slavery, will be tolerated in the Transvaal State."

That language was repeated again in the Convention of 1884; and I ask here once more a question which I remember I put from the opposite Bench in the earliest debate which we had on this subject. Supposing under the *régime* of Mr. Kruger this system of Chinese labour, carried on under the conditions prescribed and sanctioned by this Ordinance, had been sanctioned, do you suppose that Lord Milner or the right hon. Gentleman who was then Secretary for the Colonies would not have been put forward to remonstrate with him on the ground that whether slavery or not, "a system of apprenticeship partaking of the nature of slavery" had in violation of his obligations been introduced into South Africa? The noble Lord is very particular about the use of language; let me put him a question in turn. Would he describe this as free labour?

*EARL PERCY: Yes.

MR. ASQUITH: He would. Then I venture to think that his courage is better than his English, or else—for this is another possible explanation—that he understands the term "freedom" in a sense totally different from that in which it is understood by the bulk of his fellow-countrymen. But, Sir, as I have said, this is not a question of language, but a question of substance; and what we are concerned with is not by what particular epithet the state of things established under the Ordinance can be most accurately described, but whether it can be defended as it stands, and upon its merits, and if not, what is the best means of setting it right. Now, it is surprising to find that the great movement of public opinion and public feeling, the reality and volume of which no one who has been through the recent election can dispute, is still attributed, by some hon. Gentlemen opposite, at any rate, either to a manipulated agitation in which credulity and mendacity are supposed to have played equal parts, or to ignorance and to false sentiment. Now I am not going into the question at length, but I should like to put the case in the baldest possible way in which it strikes the average Englishman. What was it that you did when you established this Ordinance in South Africa? Into a country which has, Heaven knows, already had more than its share of racial problems and difficulties, you introduced, in haste and without any adequate ascertainment of the authentic opinion of the people, the members of yet another race. And how were they to come there? They were to come there not as inhabitants, not, I might almost say, even as inmates of the country. They were to come there as the temporary instruments of this industrial development, segregated from the rest of the community, not allowed to possess any domestic life of their own, cut off from the social and the other interests of their neighbours, without hope—whatever ingenuity, diligence, enterprise, and character any man among them might contribute to the work in which he was engaged—without hope of ever becoming the owner of property, or, in the country which he was enriching, finding a permanent home, and with the prospect, when their indentures came to an end and they had served their purpose, of being compulsorily sent back to the place from which they came. Now, is there any feature in that picture which is either false or exaggerated? I believe there is not, and so were we not justified—we who in the beginning opposed the whole of this experiment and opposed it strenuously throughout, and who mean to bring it to an end——

*EARL PERCY: In six years.

MR. ASQUITH: Perhaps the noble Lord will restrain his impatience for a few minutes. Were we not justified in pointing out from the first that, however honestly and however humanely it might be conducted, it was inevitably accompanied by the gravest risks of abuse? There were risks in two distinct directions. First of all in the process of recruitment—for however carefully that process was conducted, how could you discriminate in a rough-and-ready manner between good and bad characters, and still more, how could you ensure that the bulk of these men would really understand the nature of the work in which they were to be engaged, and the conditions under which it was to be carried on? And next, as regards their methods of treatment and the like, after they were landed and housed together in these compounds. I bring no charge—I do not think any of my hon. friends do—of callousness or of cruelty against the general body of our fellow-subjects in the Transvaal, whether they be our own kith and kin or from whatever race or tribe or country they derive their origin. I have always thought myself that a man might engage in the industry of gold mining perfectly legitimately—from the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer most usefully and indispensably—and might engage in that industry without leaving behind him either his heart or his conscience. But what we have said is this: A system of this kind, whatever be the good faith and the feelings of humanity with which it was intended to be worked, was inevitably subject to the gravest possible dangers and abuses. I am not going again into the questions, which have been much touched upon in these debates, of illegal punishments, which it is now admitted—unknown, I hope, to the authorities in the Transvaal, unknown certainly to the Secretary of State in this country—were practised in several of these mines. But I was very much struck by a passage I saw in one of the despatches, in a letter from a mine manager in whose mine some of these practices had prevailed. He said—

> "I have got here 100 convicted criminals, not a few of them professional assassins, who have been shipped over from China to take part in the exploitation of gold in the Transvaal."

He certainly was in a very difficult position, and I am not sure, myself, if imaginatively one can try to put oneself into the position of a man subjected to these punishments—I do not suppose the Chinaman, to do him justice, felt any grievous sense of outrage. But there you see the radical vice of the whole thing. If you import in this way wholesale for these purposes and under these conditions alien labour, you import with it the danger, the probability, I will say the certainty, of barbaric punishments which are abhorrent to the traditions and the convictions of the British people. That was the state of things—I do not think I am exaggerating—with which the present Government found themselves confronted when they came into office. What were they to do? It is quite clear, I think, to anybody of reasonable intelligence and experience that they could not simply take a wet sponge and wipe the whole thing off the slate in a moment. I remember that when the very first debate we had on this subject took place, now three years ago, an Amendment to the Address was moved by my hon. friend the present Under-Secretary for Home Affairs, a very wise Amendment, in which he asked the then House of Commons to say that this experiment should not be tried until the people of the Transvaal had had an opportunity of pronouncing their opinions upon it. I remember pointing out on that occasion that the worst of taking a step of this kind was that, once you had taken it, in a large measure, and for a long time to come, it must be irretraceable. And so I believe there is no one who thinks, or has ever encouraged the country to think at the time of the election, that these coolies could be compulsorily deported *en masse*. [Cries of "Oh."] Well, who has?

*EARL PERCY: The hon. Member for South Salford, who spoke last night, said that he gave a pledge to his constituents to that effect.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): No; he said in three months.

MR. ASQUITH: Well, of course, I cannot charge myself on the point, not having been present when my hon. friend spoke; but I can say for myself, having been almost as much as any Member through the length and breadth of the country at the time of the election, and having spoken on platform after platform with many of my hon. friends, that I never heard a suggestion, or the faintest shadow of a suggestion, that it would be possible at once *en masse* to deport these coolies. He who says that we, the Liberal Party, deceived the electors into that belief requires to substantiate his words [Cheers]. I wonder whether hon. Gentlemen who gave that faint cheer a few moments ago have ever read the history of the dealings of this country and this Parliament with West Indian slavery. That was admitted slavery. There was no question or dispute about it in any quarter. And what happened? When the great Reformed Parliament met in 1833, full of enthusiasm after the Act of 1832, the first really popular assembly that had met within these walls for the best part of a couple of hundred years, one of the first tasks to which it addressed itself was the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies. I suppose you would agree that Mr. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. Buxton were perhaps as keen and as sincere in their abhorrence of slavery and in their desire to put an end to it as even the framers of this Amendment. Well, what was the legislation of that Parliament, the carefully considered legislation of men who were as keenly desirous as any man on these benches that any reproach of this sort should be removed? They enacted that for a period of seven years these slaves, released in name at least from the *status* of slavery, were to continue as compulsory apprentices to their masters, giving three-fourths of their time and labour to those who had formerly been their owners; so anxious, and rightly anxious, were they that when an institution of this kind, good or bad, has become mixed up with the whole social and industrial life of the community, you should not, in your anxiety and legitimate eagerness to put an end to it at the earliest possible moment, inflict unmerited and unnecessary suffering on those who were affected by it. The great precedent in our history in dealing with such a matter is impossible here, and I dismiss it at once. We must show patience and walk warily and cautiously in this matter. Does any one suppose for a moment that in pursuance of our pledges we are under obligation at once to open the doors of all these compounds in South Africa and let every Chinaman loose over the veldt to run all over South Africa?

AN HON. MEMBER on the LABOUR BENCHES: No one thinks that.

MR. ASQUITH: No, I do not believe that any one thinks that. If we had done that, there is not the slightest doubt that we should have been rightly accused of establishing a reign of terror amongst our fellow subjects. Therefore, dismissing that as entirely out of the question—and it has never been suggested or even hinted at by any responsible spokesman in the Liberal Party—what are we to do as practical men, anxious to remove the dangers, and at the same time anxious not to plunge a great community into industrial and social chaos? For convenience I will divide the policy that we have announced into two heads.

First of all, I will state what we propose to do before responsible government is fully granted and while we ourselves remain directly responsible for the administration of the Transvaal. Next, I will state what we propose to do if, and when, responsible government is granted. As regards the first period, I do not think there is any misunderstanding in any quarter of the House as to what the policy of the Government is. In the first place, no new licences are to be issued. At this point I will not go into detailed argument or recrimination on the question of those 16,000 new licences so mysteriously applied for just at the very moment when the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was suggesting to the representative of the King in South Africa that it was desirable that the importations should voluntarily cease. As to existing contracts, we are not constitutionally, legally, or morally able to disturb them, but we have resolved that, as long as we are responsible, no additional licences shall be issued for the importation of a single coolie. In the next place, we are going to carry out, whether by Regulation or by Order in Council does not matter, those Amendments of the more rigorous and indefensible clauses in the Ordinance so clearly indicated by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies last night—amendments which will remove some of the more flagrant and noxious elements in the system hitherto existing. In the third place, so anxious are we that, while our responsibility lasts, it shall not be possible for any one to say that a single coolie is being kept in South Africa against his will, that we are prepared to find, from Imperial funds if necessary—though when the suggestion was first made I myself made a wry face—the money to enable the coolie to pay the cost of his passage out and back so as to free himself from a contract which was not what he expected. [AN HON. MEMBER: How much will that cost?] How can any one estimate the cost at present? When I know I will tell the hon. Member. It is the principle with which we are at present concerned. There is nobody in this House so anxious as I am to save every halfpenny of money for the State; but I feel that, inasmuch as the responsibility for this Ordinance rests, not upon the Transvaal, who were never consulted about it, but upon the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial Government, whatever expenditure is necessary for the purpose of removing this taint of compulsion from these coolies ought to be met, not out of Colonial, but out of Imperial funds.

Now I come to the question of what is to happen when responsible government is granted. As to that, there appears to be a certain amount—I will not say of misunderstanding, but of doubt, which let me try to remove. When the Transvaal receives responsible government it is our intention that it should have responsible government in the fullest and most complete sense of the term. Therefore, the question which, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, ought clearly to remain within the competence of the Transvaal Assembly will be whether or not they care to retain Chinese labour in South Africa. Do not let the House misunderstand me. I say Chinese labour. It will be for the colonists themselves to determine whether or not they will allow yellow men to go on labouring in their midst, either in the mines, on farms, or exercising any trade in any way. That is a matter which is a purely economic question, and every self-governing British Colony is perfectly entitled to say whether it will have yellow labour. If the colonists should say, "We will not have yellow men here," why should the Imperial Government interfere? It is purely a matter for them, and for nobody outside. The Transvaal Legislature must, however, have the fullest and most complete power of expressing a free and unfettered judgment upon the question. But supposing they should come to the conclusion that they will allow Chinese labourers to work in compounds within the Colony, then arises the question what are to be the conditions. A question was asked of the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies yesterday as to what is called "re-enlistment." The answer he gave was—

> "The earliest contracts will not expire before May, 1907, by which date the Transvaal will have become a self-governing Colony. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government, while reserving to themselves entire freedom of action upon the general question of the conditions under which Chinese labour is carried on, do not propose to cancel the provision of the Ordinance referred to."

The House will see that the answer is perfectly consistent with what I am going to say. We think that the new Transvaal Goverment should, in the first instance, have an opportunity of submitting its proposal upon this subject; but for that purpose it is quite essential that it should not inherit, from the state of things which now exists, the present Ordinance. If they did inherit that Ordinance, that Ordinance would be part of the law of the land; and therefore, unless something were done to annul it or repeal it or amend it, all its powers, including this power of "re-enlisting" or detaining under the conditions of that Ordinance, the coolies now out there, would automatically remain in force. We do not think that that would be right. I am not indicating for the moment what the precise method of procedure will be. That is a legal question. I could indicate three or four ways, but I do not wish at this moment to commit the Government precisely to any definite method. I am only saying what the Government mean to do and what they will carry out by one way or another—that is, to secure that the new Legislature of the Transvaal, unembarrassed and unfettered by this Ordinance, shall itself and by legislative action of its own, submit a scheme, whatever it may be, for the future dealing with Chinese labour in that Colony.

But that is not all. This is a matter in which the credit and responsibility of the Imperial Parliament are concerned. Therefore I go a step further. I say on behalf of His Majesty's Government that, while we should not think it desirable but, on the contrary, we should think it impolitic, and in some respects disrespectful, to insert in the Constitution for the new Colony any disabling condition which would even seem to suggest that we expected it to take a decision contrary to what we ourselves believe to be right and just, yet, under the power which is reserved in the Constitution of every self-governing Colony to submit all legislation of that Colony, in such cases as the Governor thinks fit, to the Royal consideration and assent, we should have the right, and we should exercise it, of dealing with legislation on this subject put forward on behalf of the Colony. What is more, I think we should make it part of the instructions given to the Governor of the new Colony that any measure dealing with labour of this kind should be expressly reserved for the consideration and assent of the Imperial Government. I will fortify myself by reading a short passage—I am sure hon. Gentlemen opposite will listen to it with great respect—from the despatch of Mr. Lyttelton to Sir Arthur Lawley, transmitting the letters patent of the Order in Council providing for the constitutional changes in the Transvaal, dated 31st March last year. Mr. Lyttelton, in that despatch, uses these words—

> "His Majesty's Government have been unable, having regard to the terms of peace signed in 1902, to make provision for the representation of any of His Majesty's coloured subjects. As a protection, however, of the interests of those sections of the population which are not directly represented in the Legislature, the Governor will, as now, be required by his instructions to reserve any Bill whereby persons not of European birth or descent may be subjected to any disability or restriction to which persons of European birth are not also subjected."

Similar instructions, the House may be sure, will be given to the Governor by His Majesty's present Government.

So, how does the matter stand? The Transvaal Government will have absolute power to determine the economic question whether or not they will have Chinamen labouring in the country. Not inheriting the Ordinance, they will be required, if they so determine, to frame legislation of their own as to the conditions under which such labour should be carried on. That legislation will, not only by the inherent power invested in the Crown in the case of colonial Constitutions, but by express instructions given to the Governor, be reserved for the consideration of His Majesty's Government at home. Let me add that, though I do not anticipate any such contingency arising, if such a contingency did arise, so long as we on this Bench are responsible for the conduct of affairs, any legislation corresponding to that of this Ordinance and inconsistent with our best British traditions would unquestionably be vetoed by the Government on behalf of the Crown. The right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite have been so long out of Opposition that perhaps it would not be fair to criticise with severity their first attempt after so many years to draw up an Amendment. Otherwise I should say that this Amendment was a singularly clumsy production. In vain is the net spread in the sight of so many clear-sighted birds. I feel perfectly confident, after the statement which my hon. friend made yesterday, and which I have endeavoured to supplement and amplify to-day, that this House of Commons by an overwhelming majority will declare that it was the duty of His Majesty's Government to do everything in their power, in view of the assurances which they and their supporters had given to the country, to set this matter right. The steps which they have taken as regards both the immediate and more remote future are the only steps which could be really effectual for the purpose without inflicting grievous and unnecessary hardship on innocent persons and upon the interests of a great and loyal community.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I entirely agree with the prediction which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman. I have no doubt he is right when he says this Amendment will be rejected by an overwhelming majority. Although he is kind enough to commiserate us on our greenness in the work of opposition, I may tell him that, when we put down this Amendment, we were not so green as to suppose that many hon. Gentlemen who have been returned to support the Government would be distracted from their allegiance. We put the Amendment down in order that we might have a full discussion and explanation of all that is connected with this most interesting subject; and I think it will be recognised on all sides that the debate has fully justified us in that proceeding. It has elicited many interesting speeches, but I, who have listened to almost all of them, venture to say that none was more needed than the very admirable speech, both in tone and temper, which was delivered by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stoke. He dealt with only one branch of the subject, but he dealt with it effectively, and nobody else has placed that point of view so clearly before us. He, speaking as he says, on behalf, at all events of a considerable body, of organised labour in this country, brushes aside the question of slavery, and he says that what interests them is the whole question of the introduction of cheap labour. There is no doubt a great deal to be said on that matter, and I, for one, am inclined to think that a good number of the votes—it is impossible to say what proportion—were undoubtedly given during the election upon this question—were given, not induced by the posters and pamphlets of which we have heard so much, but by sympathy with the view that this was the first step or, at all events, a very important step for introducing cheap competition with British labour. Of course, those who assented to this proposal did so informed, or it may be misinformed, by the great bulk of public opinion in the Transvaal, to the effect that the particular labour which the Chinaman was to supply could not be—he did not mean physically—well and properly performed by British workmen; that, in fact, to introduce such labour into a country where there was a large coloured population would be to degrade the standard of labour. That is an honest opinion expressed by a large number of persons in the Transvaal and no doubt accepted by His Majesty's late Government. Was that a right opinion? Were they misinformed? When I was in the country I had a long conversation with Mr. Creswell, who was the author of a very serious attempt to secure the introduction of a cheaper kind of white labour in place of the black labour, and although that experiment was said, I think by almost everybody connected with the mines, to have been a failure, I am well aware that Mr. Creswell himself, for whom I have the greatest respect—I concur with all that was said of him by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies—still retains his old opinion; and that, therefore, the question may be said to be one which is not decided. The people in South Africa, and especially the working classes and shop-keeping classes, sent deputations to me in every colony, and in almost every important town, to protest against the introduction of coloured labour at all, whether under indenture or ordinance, or anything else, except in connection with this particular question of the mines. They wished for stringent legislation to prevent this alien coloured immigration; and although they made great complaints against the people who came over, yet in a frank and friendly way they admitted that what they objected to was the competition of men who could live more cheaply than themselves. I said I was with them. I thought it was a strong order to say that indiscriminate immigration should be allowed whether from China or India, either of which countries could pour in a population counted by scores of millions which might altogether overwhelm the other population. Although I made representations as to the necessary moderation which must be observed, and the pains which must be taken not gratuitously to give offence to our Indian fellow subjects, yet I really had a great deal of sympathy with them on the matter; and it will be remembered that in this particular case of Chinese labour imported for the mines, the great reason and object of the clauses in the Ordinance to which His Majesty's Government take exception was to prevent Chinamen who were brought over with the idea that they should do work which no white man could do going beyond that and interfering with white labour. The hon. Member for Chester, who in the early part of the afternoon made a humorous speech, referred to something which he alleged I had said during the election to the effect that I was not favourable to Chinese immigration. I do not take any substantial objection to that, although I do not think I ever used those words. Then he said, "Why did you not say so during the period of the last Government?" If he had been in the House then he would have known I had said so; I said so in South Africa, and I reported to the last House what I had said in South Africa. I met the mine managers, a great number of whom are not British, but have come from the free and democratic country of the United States. They came to me to represent that it was becoming urgent that Chinese labour should be introduced, and that without it the development of the mines would be stopped, and that the consequences, so well described by the Under-Secretary yesterday as the result of stopping this labour, would follow from not introducing it. I told them plainly how many objections I felt to this introduction of coloured labour, and above all of Chinese labour. I myself would not have taken anything like the same objection if it had been a question of the introduction of our Indian fellow-subjects. But I pointed out the objections to them, and I told them at that time that I hoped they would exhaust every means in their power to secure labour from other sources, and give every possible encouragement to that experiment and see that it was fairly tried, and that, even when they had done that, as long as I remained at the Colonial Office, I would never consent to the introduction of Chinese labour unless I were persuaded that it was the express desire of the people of the Transvaal—I meant the whole of the white population of the Transvaal. I make that explanation to show that so long as the question is only an economic one we can argue it with the greatest good temper and good humour, and that every excuse may be made for differing views. I do not hold it myself proved that Chinese labour is desirable in the mines of the Transvaal. I think that it may be necessary—I should certainly hold that that was not disproved—but, on the other hand, I say a perfectly reasonable man, bringing honesty and intelligence to bear on the subject, may very fairly take the other view, and if that had been the only question at the general election we should not have come down here with the Amendment now proposed. I venture to follow the right hon. Gentleman, although I am bound to say I think his observations are not really relevant to the Amendment. Just let me remind the House what we ask—

> "But we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Ministers should have brought the reputation of this country into contempt by describing the employment of Chinese indentured Labour as slavery, whilst it is manifest from the tenor of Your Majesty's gracious Speech that they are contemplating no effectual method for bringing it to an end."

That is really the point we have to discuss. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, I may note in passing, said that no Minister had so described it——

MR. ASQUITH: I did not say so.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I beg pardon. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that no responsible Minister or no Cabinet Minister had described this system as slavery.

MR. ASQUITH: "His Majesty's Ministers" when used in an Amendment to the Address means the Government collectively. I said his Majesty's Ministers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think I may be excused for misunderstanding the right hon. Gentleman. Of course His Majesty's Ministers, if they are to speak with a single voice, must speak by some public document given in their name. I do not think that is the intention of this Amendment; but certainly I am under the impression that certain Ministers did describe it as slavery, both during the election and afterwards. Then this matter being before the people at the general election was universally stated; posters and other documents were circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land in which the late Government and its supporters were accused of introducing slavery. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs last night said most frankly and fairly that this was one of the two great Party cries at the last election, and not only was this the indictment against us, but we were at the election found guilty upon that indictment, and we were punished on that indictment; and when some one made that statement before I heard some hon. Members say that we were rightly punished. Scores of our friends, and perhaps more than that, lost their seats upon this great Party cry, upon this indictment; and we intend by this Amendment to say that the verdict was obtained under false pretences. The Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke very lightly of verbal distinctions. I do not call it a mere verbal distinction to say that an Ordinance is or is not slavery. Everybody in the country knows perfectly well what is meant by the accusation of reintroducing slavery. I do not wonder that those who believed in that accusation, or were persuaded to believe in it, treated it as a very serious affair, and they punished us, as I said—and I agree rightly, if the accusation is true. Now I say it is not a verbal matter of which we complain. I have here a book widely circulated during the election, which I have only seen since, and which contains a very full statement of those cartoons which have been reproduced here, and a great number of statements published about the treatment of the Chinese. It is an accusation of the introduction of slavery in the most brutal form. It is published anonymously; but from internal evidence I think it is pretty clear that it was written either by Mr. Boland, who was the gentleman mentioned in the Blue-book as having said that it was his profession to find or make sensational statements, or by a man whom I should unhesitatingly describe as a great scoundrel—that is Mr. Pless, who confessedly hung up and tortured a Chinaman for a whole night in order that he might photograph him next morning for a book he was writing. Things of that sort are not worthy of attention; and I should not have noticed this book for anything in the book itself, but it has a preface written by the Rev. Dr. Clifford, who, as is very well known, is a most eminent dissenting minister, and whose authority and good faith must be recognised in a House which I am told consists in so large a proportion of Nonconformists. Now what impression was produced on Dr. Clifford's mind, and what impression in regard to this matter did he seek to produce on the minds of those whom he influenced? Dr. Clifford said—

> "This is an authentic story of one of the foulest tragedies in our British annals."

Is that true? [Some MINISTERIAL cries of "Yes."] The answer is rather feeble.

> "It is another blood-stained page in the history of the inhumanity of man to man, it is a blight upon our Empire and, chiefest of all, it is inevitably and overwhelmingly immoral."

He says—

> "It is a wanton iniquity, it is not freedom."

and he goes on to say—

> "It is shuffling of the meanest kind to say that it is not slavery."

And then he says—

> "It must go."

There we are all agreed; assume the premisses, if it be all that Dr. Clifford says it is, and many Gentlemen in this House by their cheers show that they think it is, it must go. Yes, but it is not going. Now remember it is "the meanest shuffling" to say that this system is not slavery, but we were accused of introducing and supporting and approving slavery. That is the *gravamen* of the charge against us. Well, how did the Under-Secretary for the Colonies begin his speech yesterday? He said—

> "The conditions do not, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government"

it is the whole Government now—

> "constitute a state of slavery."

What do they constitute? To call it slavery is "a terminological inexactitude." That is English as she is wrote at the Colonial Office. Eleven syllables, many of them of Latin or Greek derivation, when one good English word, a Saxon word of a single syllable, would do! But it is quite sufficient. Although I do not expect, and never have expected, that they will show themselves in the lobbies this afternoon, yet it cannot be denied that there are two Parties on this question in the majority—in the Government and amongst their followers. There is the Party, for instance, who allowed these statements, these accusations brought against us, to be made wholesale. [An HON. MEMBER: They could not help it.] You are too hasty in your interruption—those who allowed these statements to be made in the country without any correction or any contradiction knowing them to be untrue. Why could not His Majesty's Government have called them then, during the election, "a terminological inexactitude"? No. They knew these statements to be untrue, and they profited by them. Then there is a much larger number, I believe, a majority of the great majority opposite, who believe those statements to be true, who still believe them to be true, and who promised their constituents to abolish the state of things of which they naturally complained. They promised to do all in their power—some went beyond that—but it is sufficient for my purpose to say that they promised to do all in their power to put a stop to this discreditable state of things, to put a stop to "one of the foulest tragedies in our British annals." Yesterday, all these gentlemen sat dumb, except when they interrupted, but none of them, with, perhaps, one exception, got up to say that "this is not what we expected from our Government." I can argue, I must argue, by the necessities of the case [MINISTERIAL laughter]—I do not see the point of that interruption—if I am to make out my case, I must necessarily argue upon the two hypotheses which seem to exist in the minds of the majority opposite, the first hypothesis being that this statement is untrue, and the second that it is true. In the first place, supposing it is not true, and that this is an Ordinance the worst conditions of which we were told by the Under-Secretary yesterday, are not necessarily indefensible, but, taken cumulatively, do constitute a bad standard. Then all I can say is that those who take that view acquit us of the crime with which they charged us during the election. Nobody ever pretended that the Ordinance was necessarily perfect, and could not be improved and amended, but there is all the difference in the world between an amendment of the Ordinance and the institution of the crime of slavery in a British colony. In that case, all that we could be charged with was, at the worst, an administrative error. That does not constitute the gist of our complaint to-day. Does any one mean to tell me that the speech delivered by the Under-Secretary yesterday, or the speech delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day, would have gained seats? [Cries of "Certainly."] They would not have gained a single vote.

*MR. CHURCHILL said the words he used in his speech were, almost word for word, those he used in his election at Manchester.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: And what you said under those circumstances in the election at Manchester did not gain you any votes. What did gain the hon. Gentleman votes was the production of these posters and placards, and the parading of every street in his constituency by a gang of men dressed as Chinamen, and accompanied by some agent got up as a slave-driver.

*MR. CHURCHILL said that this statement was imaginative, but it was not true.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The incident owes nothing to my imagination. I sympathised with the Under-Secretary because he had to make that speech yesterday. He had, in effect, to tell his followers that they had all been on the wrong line, that they had all been misinformed, that the charge they had made was only an inexactitude. And, naturally enough, I can conceive that, when he was preparing the speech, he was in some difficulty. I can imagine that he would have said to himself, "It is not a very palatable dose for my supporters, but, perhaps, I can season it with some carefully prepared and elaborate epigrams upon the Member for West Birmingham. They have nothing whatever to do with this question, but they always go down, and, if I can only put in enough of them, they will very likely take the rest, which is not nearly so pleasant." Assuming his view to be correct, and to be the view of the majority of the House of Commons, then I have no complaint, no substantial complaint, to make of the proposed action of the Government. What is it they are going to do? They have told us, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been pleased to remind us, that they are not going to have any sudden change. The Chancellor of the Exchequer reminded us of the action taken in 1833 with regard to slavery, and that it took seven years to put down that slavery, and he said that seven years would be quite a reasonable time in which to put down "the foulest tragedy" in our annals. I say from their point of view it is not a tragedy. It is nothing but an inaccurate and unsatisfactory deed of agreement which can be put right by some trumpery amendment. Then, again, he tells us that colonial opinion must be consulted. That is the only additional information which has been given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day. The Under-Secretary said that colonial opinion was to be consulted, and that, if colonial opinion was in favour of the continuance of the existing state of things, though he did not wish to be questioned about methods, he thought there was some mysterious way in which he could operate on the Dowager-Empress of China.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Send her a telegram, "How is Mrs. Kruger?"

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I know a good deal about the powers of the Colonial Office, but I really do not think they are sufficient to prevent Chinamen from going to the Transvaal unless there is an ordinance and legislation to prevent them in the Transvaal itself. But, says the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the first time, before we proceed to this policy we are going to veto Transvaal legislation. We will warn them beforehand at the same time that, while we trust them absolutely and are convinced that they will follow the humane desires which we have expressed, we have a rod in pickle for them, and that the veto of the Crown shall be exercised upon a matter which, *ex hypothesi*, is the most important matter that will, in the early years, come before them. Are they content, when they say that, and when at the present moment the British flag is stained with the horrors of slavery, to rest themselves upon a possible exercise of the veto upon legislation desired by a self-governing colony?

Then, as I have said, they are going to make some Amendments which are so trumpery, so unimportant, that they are not worth a moment's consideration, and, lastly, they have got their great card. And what is it? They are going to encourage the Chinese to take a holiday at the expense of the British taxpayers. This idea of repatriation seems to me to be perfectly ridiculous. I wonder whether they have read their own Blue-book. Here is a despatch from Lord Selborne. He says—

> "The total number of Chinese labourers who have been repatriated for one cause or another since importation of Chinese began is 1,956."

*Mr. CHURCHILL: Many of these were able to pay their own way back.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I daresay a certain proportion, but only a very small proportion, were repatriated at their own expense.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: About 150.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I will accept the figure. If, then, 150 Chinamen, at their own expense, were able to get back to China, I doubt whether it is necessary to come upon the taxes in order to afford the means for bringing back a greater number. Here, however, is another important statement in the same despatch—

> "Of these, 1,233 have tried to re-engage at Chingwangtao, and have been prevented there; 222 have tried to re-engage at Chifu, and have been prevented there. Of the balance of 500, a number, estimated at 100, have succeeded in making their way back to the Rand. This leaves only 400 unaccounted for, and these 400 include all who may have died after repatriation or have been in such a state of health as to make it useless for them to attempt to re-engage."

So that, of the 60,000 Chinese on the Rand, of whom you profess to believe that they have been deceived in order to get them there, less than 2,000 have gone back before their time, and of that number more than half made every effort to get back to the Rand again. The policy of the Government—and, again, I say, from their point of view, I see no objection—is to allow this system, which they think is slavery, to peter out. We are to have this novel idea—we are to have freedom on the instalment system. When hon. Gentlemen opposite speak of "magnates" they always appear to think of some persons who are not creditable acquaintances, and who live in palaces, mostly in Park Lane. But when this change is to be made, whom do the Government consult? I am assured that the terms of this alteration were submitted to the magnates before they were submitted to the House of Commons.

Mr. ASQUITH: To whom?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: When the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary quoted an anonymous gentleman yesterday and was asked for the name, he refused to give it, and you approved. For the same reason I refuse to give the name. Now I will go on——

Mr. ASQUITH: There is no truth whatever in it.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman makes the explicit statement that the details of the policy which the Government have, through the Under-Secretary and through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, explained to the House were first submitted to some unknown person or persons called "magnates" living more or less in Park Lane?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: You called them magnates. At least the Chancellor of the Exchequer did so.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I quote the words of the right hon. Gentleman—magnates living more or less in Park Lane. I may say at once that to my knowledge there is not a word of truth in it. I think we are entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman not so much for the particular names concerned, but what is his authority for a statement which has not the slightest foundation in truth.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I shall be happy to make further inquiries. My statement is, of course, not that every single thing that has been said was communicated in writing to anybody. That is not my statement. But substantially they were made aware of the principal reforms or alterations intended by the Government, and I am also informed that they were quite content.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Who are "they?"

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The representatives of the mining interests on the Rand. I refuse to name.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I say there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N): On a point of order, Sir, may I ask whether, when a Member of this House makes a direct charge against any other Member, and the Member accused says there is not a word of truth in the charge, the ordinary rules and customs of the House do not require the hon. Member who made the charge to withdraw it?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand that there was any charge either direct or indirect made against any Member of this House.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN again rose, but was prevented from speaking by loud Ministerial cries of "Withdraw."

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know what the object of your charge is.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I should not have called it a charge. The statement which I made was based on information. I am not certain that it is true. It is now denied by the right hon. Gentleman and, of course, I accept his statement, so far as he is concerned. But suppose it were true—the statement that these gentlemen were consulted or conferred with—it would not be a charge.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would be a false statement.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Under-Secretary told us that the object of our Amendment was to urge upon the Government more drastic methods than they themselves would be inclined to adopt. That is not the object of this Amendment. We put this Amendment down as a test of sincerity. You have assented to the charges which have been made against us, and were made against us by the preface from which I have quoted. Are you satisfied with the excuses the Government have given you for not proceeding to do away with what you consider to be slavery and a foul blot on the Empire? If you are satisfied, all I can say is that we shall present our case to the country. We shall say that you made these charges, you professed to believe them, and you did nothing to secure any remedy for that state of things. Can you stop this system at once? [Ministerial cries of "No."] Yes you can. [Ministerial cries of "How?"] You can repatriate the whole as you repatriate some. The reasons given for not repatriating the whole are, to my mind, very weak reasons. One reason is that you will have to pay compensation: it is a question of expense. Very well, but there is a question of morality. We do not think there is any necessity for taking any drastic measures, and the Government do not believe it is slavery; I say that the excuse of expense is a paltry one, and those who do believe it is slavery cannot accept these reasons for not doing what they say ought to be done.

An HON. MEMBER: They can all go back now if they like.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Then they say, "We are bound by the action of our predecessors." The Under-Secretary for the Colonies gave us as an illustration the Agricultural Rates Act. Yes, it is an illustration of precisely the sort of thing. What happened in the case of the Agricultural Rates Act? When it was first produced the Government were accused of every iniquity. It was said to be gross corruption, and bribery of the landlords, not a very popular class, of this country, and that accusation was continued for a year or two. But the moment the Party opposite came within sight of power they allowed it to be known that they would not withdraw this dole and bribe, and it has been publicly announced since that it is to be continued for the present. Then we were told by the Under-Secretary that there would be economic calamity in the Transvaal, the finances of the country would be dislocated. He actually threatened us in tragic tones with famine in Johannesburg, and he shuddered at the consequences which might accrue to investors in mining securities. That is all right, I dare say. But you should have thought of all this before. If you knew that for these reasons it would be impossible for you to take any immediate steps, if you were to wait seven years, or, it may be, a greater number of years before doing anything in the matter, at least you ought to have allowed the people whom you have deluded to know what was your intention. The hon. Member spoke about humanitarian and moral reasons, and rather sneered at us and claimed a monopoly of virtue for himself and for the Party with whom he works. He made broad his phylacteries, and thanked Heaven he was not as other men. We care as much for humanity and morality as the other side. What we complain of is that you used your humanity and your morality in order to get seats, and, when you have succeeded, then you neglect those considerations altogether. Then the hon. Gentleman says he explained the intellectual considerations on which the Government have acted, but we do not understand them; I admit he is right in the latter part of the statement. I certainly do not understand such intellectual considerations as these. During this election you allowed us to be accused of "the foulest tragedy of modern times." Now you are content that it should be regarded as a contract every article of which may be defended separately. If you are content to accept an explanation of that kind, then I tell you there is no tragedy, but there is a contemptible farce. You have allowed these statements to be circulated abroad. Not merely have we been held up to our own countrymen, but our country and our countrymen have been held up to the world as guilty of the most immoral and inhuman offences. I do not envy the task of the British Ambassador when he goes to a conference on Congo atrocities. I say that by these statements, whether they be true or not, we have placed our country in a bad position [Cries of "You have"] to speak of the inhumanity of others. I want to know whether they are true or not. You do not prove them by asserting them from these Benches or from those. You can only prove them to be true by an inquiry. Now, as I sit down, I repeat my appeal for an inquiry. I ask for a judicial inquiry. It is asked for on behalf of those whom you have calumniated in this country; it is asked for by and on behalf of our fellow-subjects in the Transvaal whom you have slandered there; it is asked for by Lord Selborne, your own Governor ["No, no"] and on behalf of the official classes whom you have traduced. If you refuse to give it, it is because you are afraid of the result.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 91; Noes, 416. (Division List No. 2.)

AYES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHnHugoO.
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Hon.Guy(Winchester)
Beach, HnMichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Joicey (Stamford)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Clarke, Rt.HnSirE(CityLond.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthorpe, G. Loyd
Craig, CaptainJames(Down,E)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert(LanarkGovan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, SirWEvans-(T'rHam.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(KentAshford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.WF(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir JohnH.
Kenyon-SlaneyRt HonCol.W.
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon.FrederickWm.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, RtHonLt.Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, Harry Hananel (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson,MajorE.C.
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, SirGilbert(Gravesend)
PeaseHerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, HonLionelWalter
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.ThosMyles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn.Arthur Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.

Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. M. (Lanark, N. W.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. C. E. (Howard)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williamson, G.H. (Worcester)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES,—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Gloucester)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. G.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hiliare Joseph Peter R.
Benn, John Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W (Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davis, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsey (Galw'y
Devlin, Joseph (Belfast, West)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. M. (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. A (Herefordsh. S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gillholly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss'sh
Harrington Timothy
Hart-Davis, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles Solomon
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George

Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmond B. (Leominster)
Lamb, Earnest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Madison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry, (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alfred
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza-
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Right Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Moss, Samuel
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N (D'ncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S hampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan, V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robarts, Hon. T. C. A. (Bodmin)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Br'dford
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Charles D. (Hyde)
Schwann, C. E. (Manch'ster, N.
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daviel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesly
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, E. P. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (S'merset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (S'thampton)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, W. L. (Carmarthen)
Williamson, A. (Elgin & Nairn)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesborough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

NEW BILLS.

JURORS' EXPENSES.

Bill to provide for the payment of the Expenses of Jurors attending assizes and quarter sessions in England and Wales, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. Moss, Mr. Hay Morgan, and Mr. Bertram.

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

"To provide for the payment of the Expenses of Jurors attending assizes and quarter sessions in England and Wales," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 43.]

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT (1893) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend The Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1893; and for other purposes relating thereto, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Courtenay Warner, and Mr. Luttrell.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT (1893) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1893; and for other purposes relating thereto," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 16th March, and to be printed. [Bill 44.]

SMALL HOLDINGS.

Bill to further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. George White, Mr. Lyell, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Luttrell, Sir John Jardine, and Mr. Cobbold.

SMALL HOLDINGS BILL.

"To further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 45.]

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES).

Bill to amend the Law relating to Coroners' Inquests in the case of Fatal Accidents on Railways, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Bell, Mr. Charles E. Schwann, and Mr. Hudson.

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Coroners' Inquests in the case of Fatal Accidents on Railways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 46.]

OLD AGE PENSIONS (NO. 2).

Bill to provide Pensions for persons over sixty-five years of age, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Sir Walter Foster.

OLD AGE PENSIONS (NO. 2) BILL.

"To provide Pensions for persons over sixty-five years of age," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 9th March, and to be printed. [Bill 47.]

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 26th February, 1906.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Accrington District Gas and Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Channel Ferry Railway and Quay Bill [H.L.]; Clacton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Dover Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Dover Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill [H.L.]; Fulwood Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [H.L.]; Haslington Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill [H.L.]; London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Churches Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill [H.L.]; Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [H.L.]; Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [H.L.]; Rugby Subordinate School Bill [H.L.]; Thames Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Vauclain's Patent Bill [H.L.]; Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]—Presented, and read 1^{a}.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase) Bill [H.L.]; Bridgewater Canals Bill [H.L.]; Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Crediton Lighting and Power Bill [H.L.]; Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]; Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society Bill [H.L.]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill [H.L.]; Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [H.L.]; Holyhead Water Bill [H.L.]; H. R Baines & Company Bill [H.L.]; Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.]; Hull Joint Dock Bill [H.L.]; Kent Collieries Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Kent Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Kidderminster Gas Bill [H.L.]; Knott End Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [H.L.]; London and North Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; Manchester and Milford Railway Bill [H.L.]; Maryport Harbour Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Railway Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]; Mirfield Gas Bill [H.L.]; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill [H.L.]; National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill [H.L. ; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; North Sussex Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill [H.L.]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Portsmouth Water Bill [H.L.]; Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Assay Office Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [H.L.]; Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Trent Navigation Company Bill [H.L.]; Truro Gas Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Presented; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (1905-6) (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE).

Estimate of the further amount required during the year ended 31st March, 1906, beyond the sum already provided in the grant for Navy Services for the year.

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 645. Germany (Agriculture in Germany).

INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

Further Papers regarding the administration of the Army in India (in continuation of [Cd. 2718.]).

VAGRANCY.

Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy. Volume 1.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors, for the year ended 31st December, 1905.

ROUMANIA: NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF (INTERIM STATEMENT).

Translation of the new Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by the commercial treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany, together with a summary of the new law relating to tare on goods dutiable by weight.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Return of all sums received by the visitors of lunatics for travelling expenses or upon any other account from the 1st January to the 31st December, 1905.

BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Eleventh Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the registrars under the Building Societies Acts; with an abstract of the annual accounts and statements of societies for the year 1905.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES, AND TRADE UNIONS.

Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, for the year ended 31st December, 1905.

GREEK LOAN OF 1832.

Account for 1905.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Orders made by the councils of the following county borough and city, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain shops in the county borough of Southport; city of Wakefield.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Report to His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department by G. A. Bonner, Esq., Barrister-at-law, on the draft regulations proposed to be made for the processes of spinning and weaving flax and tow, and the processes incidental thereto.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACT, 1891 (MEASURING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF PRISONERS.

Regulations, dated 22nd February, 1906, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 8 of the Penal Servitude Act, 1891, applying the provisions of the regulations dated 20th June, 1896, relating to the measuring and photographing of prisoners, to any alien in respect of whom a certificate has been given under Section 3 (1) of the Aliens Act, 1891.

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND): (ACCOUNTS, 1904-1905).

Accounts of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1905, and from 26th July, 1869 (date of the Irish Church Act) to 31st March, 1905, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General theron.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Regulations made by the Local Government Board under the Act—Regulations for carrying the Act into effect made under Section 4 (3) of the Act (Principal

Regulations); Regulations temporarily modifying the principal regulations; Regulations amending the principal regulations in regard to the record paper.

SUPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury minutes, granting under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act retired allowances to—Walter Robert Hoyles (Principal Foreman, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office). (19th February, 1906); William Walter Kellaway (late Engineer (1st class) Engineer-in-Chief's Department, Post Office). (20th February, 1906); Lewis Robert Ambrose, Claudius Robert Brock, Harry Clarke, Henry Eden, Henry Haley, James William Jater, William James Jater, William Samuel Priest, William Taylor, Overseers and Senior Telegraphists, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887. (20th February, 1906).

II. Treasury minute, declaring Hanoi Tonquin French Indo-China, to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1896. (26th February, 1906).

NATIONAL DEBT (MILITARY SAVINGS BANK).

An account of the gross amount of all moneys received and paid by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, on account of "the Fund for Military Savings Banks," from 19th September, 1845, to 5th January, 1906.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Report of the proceedings of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks, for the year ended 20th November, 1905; with Appendices. Fourteenth Annual Report.

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.

Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, establishing two residentiary canonries in the Cathedral Church of Newcastle, in addition to the two established by Order in Council of 26th November, 1900.

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.

Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, exempting certain mixtures of picric acid from all restrictions under the Explosives Act, 1875, when kept and conveyed in manner specified.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Order in Council, dated 16th February, 1906, entitled "The Southern Nigeria Protectorate Order in Council, 1906."

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to codify the law relating to marine insurance.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL.

A Bill for the better prevention of corruption.

Were presented by the Earl of Halsbury; read 1^a, and to be printed.

THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.

*VISCOUNT MILNER rose to call attention to the situation in South Africa, and to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he could give the House any information as to the form of the proposed Constitutions of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The noble Viscount said: My Lords, I feel that I stand in special need of that indulgence which your Lordships are always ready to accord to one who addresses you for the first time. I can honestly say that it is only with the greatest reluctance and from a strong sense of public duty that I am bringing up this matter at all to-day.

At first sight the moment may not appear opportune. The noble Earl the Secretary of State may say:—"We have told you that we are giving this matter our most careful consideration, and that we find it a very difficult and complicated one. The Prime Minister stated only last Monday that he was wofully in want of information; the noble Marquess the Leader of this House stated on the same day that we were obliged to make further inquiry on a variety of subjects; under these circumstances, how can you expect us, after only a week, to give you full particulars?" I admit the force of that, and I may say that the last thing I wish to do in this matter is to hurry the noble Earl or the Government. The more complete their knowledge the better. But without going into every detail I think the noble Earl may be glad of an opportunity of making some statement on the general trend of the Government's policy, especially on points which have not attracted so much attention as Chinese labour.

I see it assumed in some quarters friendly to the Government that their guiding principle is simply to reverse everything done by their predecessors. If that is the case, I think that the country, which has certainly never given its approval to such a proceeding, is entitled to know what is contemplated before it is too late. I hardly think myself that that can be their intention. Still, there are certain disquieting symptoms—witness the whoop of triumph with which the Speech from the Throne and the commentaries of Ministers upon it have been received by the whole anti-British Press of South Africa and by the agitators who since the conclusion of peace have never ceased to discredit and obstruct all the efforts of His Majesty's servants in that country, even when they were of the most direct benefit to the mass of the Boer people.

That insidious and absolutely consistent enemy of this country, *Ons Land*, breaks into a pæan because the Lyttelton-Milner *régime* is as "dead as a door nail." *Ons Land* is really almost as happy, and, of course, more demonstrative than on the occasion of our military disasters at the beginning of the war. I say these are disquieting symptoms; I hope the noble Earl will be able to dispel our alarm —the alarm of those who did not sympathise with the enemy during the war, and do not want to see all the hard and costly work accomplished since its conclusion mutilated or undone.

I should like to point out to your Lordships some of the principal points with respect of which we are in suspense, and very anxious suspense. First of all, there was a passage in His Majesty's Speech which seems to me to have received much less attention than it deserved. I refer to the brief paragraph which announced the immediate grant of full responsible Government to the Orange River Colony. The noble Marquess the Leader of this House seemed to treat that as a matter of course. He even said that he had never been quite able to understand why the late Government did not deal with the Orange River Colony in the same way as with the Transvaal. I cannot say what reasons weighed with the late Government; but to me it seems tolerably obvious that, if you are tempted to make the same risky experiment in two places, you naturally try it first in the place where the risk is less, and not in that where it is immeasurably greater.

I trust the Government are under no illusions as to the extent of the risk in the Orange River Colony. What, after all, do we mean when we talk of giving responsible government to a colony? It means giving it, virtually, complete independence under the Crown. There remains, no doubt, the Governor's veto on legislation, a veto very rarely exercised, very invidious in its exercise, but still, as far as it goes, a certain power; but in executive matters the whole authority rests exclusively with His Majesty's Ministers. I think it was the late Lord Salisbury who once pithily described the situation by saying that the only bond between the Mother Country and a colony with responsible government was the bond of affection. But what if that, the only bond, is lacking? And in this case how can any reasonable man expect it already to exist?

Here is a colony, three-quarters of whose inhabitants have been at war with you up to less than four years ago, a war that was fought with the utmost determination to the bitter end. It is true that they have been treated since then with a generosity which I believe has no parallel in history, that everything has been done, both to restore their material prosperity and to spare their susceptibilities, and that this treatment has not been without its effect. I believe that my friend, the Lieutenant-Governor of that colony, is probably to-day one of the most popular men within its borders, with Boers quite as much as with Britons. But though all that is very satisfactory as far as it goes, it does not amount to anything that by the wildest stretch of imagination could be called affection for British institutions, or the British Empire.

The process of reconciling the Boers to the new political conditions has been quite as rapid as any rational being could expect. No doubt, however, it would have been even more rapid, and the prospect to-day would be far brighter, but for one most regrettable circumstance. I refer to the fact that almost every man of influence among them—their leaders in the war, to whom they cling with a loyalty which does them honour, the ministers of their Church, whose influence over them is notorious, and the leading writers in the Dutch Press—have from the very outset devoted themselves to thwarting the policy of reconciliation and to keeping alive by every means in their power the bitterest memories of the war. There have no doubt been some honourable exceptions, but in the great majority of cases this has been the attitude adopted by the leaders of the Boers in both the late Republics. Only last month ex-President Steyn, who was merely taking a line which has been taken over and over again by other leaders, made a speech to a Boer audience at Dewetsdorp and exhorted the mothers who had "suffered so much" in the concentration camps to remember those sufferings, and to see that their children were not unmindful of the story.

That is bad enough; but there are still worse tactics to which the Boer leaders continually resort. I refer to the policy of trying to stir up the more ignorant and illiterate portion of the Boer people, and to excite and maintain their hatred of the British *régime* by the constant assertion, the mendacious assertion, that Great Britain has not fulfilled the obligations which she undertook under the terms of surrender. How, in the face of the plain letter of that document, out of which that accusation has over and over again been refuted, any human being can still go on reiterating it absolutely passes my comprehension. But any stick is good enough to beat a dog with, and any fiction, however malicious, however ridiculous, is good enough for these gentlemen if it can only thereby foster animosity to Great Britain.

What is going to happen under responsible government? It is more than probable—it is, humanly speaking, certain—that the persons to whom I have referred will form a large majority, if not almost the whole, of that first elected Parliament of the Orange River Colony to which, from the first hour of its existence, the whole legislative and executive power in that Colony is to be entrusted. I do not suggest that they will begin by doing anything sensational. All forms will be duly observed; as why should they not be? It will be perfectly possible for them, with the most complete constitutional propriety, little by little to reverse all that has been done, and gradually to get rid of the British officials, the British teachers, the bulk of the British settlers, and any offensive British taint which may cling to the Statute-book or the administration.

I can quite understand that from the point of view of what are known as the "pro-Boers" such a result is eminently desirable. They thought the war was a crime, the annexation a blunder, and they think to-day that the sooner you can get back to the old state of things the better. I say I quite understand that view, though I do not suppose that it is shared by His Majesty's Ministers, or, at any rate, by all of them. What I cannot understand is how any human being, not being a "pro-Boer," can regard with equanimity the prospect that the very hand which drafted the ultimatum of October, 1899, may within a year be drafting "Ministers' Minutes" for submission to a British Governor who will have virtually no option but to obey them.

What will be the contents of these Minutes, I wonder? As time goes on it may be a proposal for dispensing with English as an official language, or a proposal for the distribution to every country farmer of a military rifle and so many hundred cartridges, in view of threatened danger from the Basutos. I think I can see the Governor just hesitating a little to put his hand to such a document. In that case, I think I can hear the instant low growl of menace from Press and platform and pulpit, the hints of the necessity of his recall, and the answering scream from a certain section of the Press of Britain against the ruthless satrap, ignorant of constitutional usage and wholly misunderstanding his own position, who dared to trample upon the rights of a free people.

I may be told, I know I shall be told, that such notions are the wild imaginings of a disordered brain, that these are theoretical possibilities having no relation to fact or probability. They are not imaginings. They are just reminiscences. I know what it is to be Governor of a self-governing colony, with the disaffected element in the ascendant. I was bitterly attacked for not being sufficiently submissive under the circumstances. Yet even with the least submissive Governor the position is so weak that strange things happen. It was under responsible government, and in the normal working of responsible government, that 1,000,000 cartridges were passed through Cape Colony on the eve of the war, to arm the people who were just going to attack us, and that some necessary cannon were stopped from being sent to a defenceless border town, which directly afterwards was besieged, and which, from want of these cannon, was nearly taken.

But, quite apart from these questions of very real but more remote interest, I do want most earnestly to ask His Majesty's Government this most immediate, urgent, practical question. What are you going to do in the Orange River Colony about the new British settlers upon the land—those, I mean, who are Government tenants—about the British teachers in Government schools, about the constabulary, about the officials, high or low, but especially the humbler of them, who have served you with such devotion during these last arduous years? Are you just going to hand them over like that without any further concern as to what may happen to them, with their legal rights, no doubt, such as they may be, but with no safeguards against hostile administrative action?

Remember, this is no case of gradual constitutional development. It is the case of a sudden revolution. Loyalty to the old system will be a black mark against a man under the new. The Government must surely feel that, if it is a question between the grant of full responsible government and this country keeping faith, they should choose the latter. In that case they will find that they have, after all, got to qualify their grant of responsible government and to proceed in a more gradual and circumspect manner than the words of His Majesty's Speech seem to imply. It is perfectly possible to do this. I believe it is absolutely more practical than the *per saltum* method. And, again, if they are wise and if they really, as the Prime Minister says, are looking forward to federation, they would do well to reserve certain powers in both the new colonies affecting matters which are of more than local importance until they are in a position to hand them over to a Federal Government.

And now, returning to the general line of my argument, let me say that, as far as the attitude of the Boer leaders is concerned, there is absolutely no difference between the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. But, in the case of the Transvaal, the danger arising from that attitude is less considerable. Unless the Transvaal is ruined and depopulated by blows levelled at its principal industry, or unless the distribution of political power in that colony is absolutely unfair, the British element, whether or not it obtains a majority in the Legislature, will in any case command so strong a minority that it should be able to protect itself and should, if it is not hopelessly alienated by our attitude towards it, supply to a great extent that bond of affection which, according to the great statesman I have already quoted, was the only bond which held self-governing colonies to the mother country. Surely, under these circumstances, it is not surprising that in the work of constitutional development the late Government should have given priority to the case of the Transvaal, and should have contemplated the two colonies proceeding in echelon, if I may use the expression, to the goal of ultimate complete self-government, which was the same for both.

I know it may be said that the fears I have expressed about the Orange River Colony amount to a plea for perpetual

Crown colony government in that country, that they leave no hope of its ever being in a satisfactory condition under responsible government, and that, therefore, as we are bound sooner or later to give it responsible government, why not give it now; why irritate them by delay? My Lords, I would like to join issue in the most direct manner with those who take up this position. In the first place, let me say that I am an out-and-out advocate of ultimate complete self-government, even in the Orange River Colony. If I had not been, I could never have put my hand to the Terms of Surrender in which that prospect was referred to. But I was satisfied that we were not holding out the hope of anything which we were not certain to grant in any case, and that complete self-government on the basis of the political equality of all white men was the only possible, the only desirable, goal of the work of political reconstruction in both colonies.

To that goal every line of our policy, so far as I was responsible for it, has converged. Nor have I ever doubted that, though the road might be long, though the process might be slow, and must, if it was to stand the best chance of success, be gradual, with patience and circumspection we should be able ultimately to arrive at a thoroughly satisfactory result. Every year that passed the bitter memories of the war would grow a little more distant, and the trick of playing upon them less effective. Every year the obvious solicitude of the Government for the welfare of the people, the multiplication of good schools, the improvement of agriculture, the spread of railways, the hundred and one works of material advancement, would win us friends or diminish the hostility of enemies. Every year the new population would become more firmly rooted on the soil, and get on to better terms with the older inhabitants. Let me be quite frank and say that, even in the most favourable circumstances, even if sufficient time had been granted for all these influences to produce their inevitable effect, we might have found, when we came to granting complete self-government to the Orange River Colony, it was still a source of some solicitude to Imperial statesmen. But I felt that, if things went well elsewhere, it would not be a real source of danger.

And here I come to the kernel of the whole business. Whether responsible government in the Orange River Colony can, or cannot, be introduced with safety depends on the general political situation throughout South Africa. Natal and Rhodesia are all right in any case. But in the Cape Colony, when the rebels are restored to the register, as they soon must be, the Bond will no doubt once more assert its domination; and with the Cape Colony under Bond domination I say that it is a very risky business to give complete self-government to the Orange River Colony, unless we can absolutely rely, to restore the balance, upon a prosperous and loyal Transvaal. That was, and is, the key of the whole South African situation.

If I may digress for a moment, I should like to say that people in England have never fully appreciated—and that is one of the weakest points in the whole position—how great, how decisive, that prosperity and loyalty of the Transvaal in favourable circumstances might be; how important a factor in the peaceful federation of South Africa and the whole future of the Empire. Just now the Transvaal, indeed all South Africa, is under a cloud. It has cost us great sacrifices. The compensations which we expected, and reasonably expected, have not come, and people rush to the conclusion that they will never come. The local difficulties of the Transvaal—though this is the fault of our Party system and not of the Colony—are a curse to the political life of this country. Men are sick of the whole affair, and, as is always the case under such circumstances, the croakers are magnifying every trouble and spreading broadcast the most gloomy anticipations.

Well, I am old enough to have lived through all this before. I remember when year after year this same gloom, these same jeremiads were all concentrated on our policy in Egypt. That was before we had had time to make Egypt a magnificent success. And the analogy of Egypt applies also in other respects. All this calumny with which the air is thick, all this raving about mammon and "Randlords," and the war having been a war for gold, and the liberties of a people having been trampled under foot to satisfy the greed of ruthless capitalists—substitute "bondholders" for "Randlords" and you have an almost literal repetition of the hysterics of the early eighties. To-day the detractors have altered their tune about Egypt, and are even extolling our work there, which, if they had their way, would never have been done, in order to discredit by contrast our work in South Africa, which is still passing through the years of stress and strain. I do not suggest, for a moment, that the circumstances of the two countries are in any way similar. But the moral—the moral of patience, of tenacity, of turning a deaf ear to the consistent vilifiers of the policy of their country, and of the honour of its statesmen—is the same.

My Lords, as I have said, if you aim at political stability in South Africa you need a prosperous and loyal Transvaal. The right plan in my opinion was to go gently until you had built it up. A cautious line in constitutional development, and full steam ahead in the material recuperation of the country—that was the true policy in both the new Colonies—always with a view to ultimate complete self-government. But as you have decided against the gradual method, as you are going not only to plunge into full self-government at once in the Transvaal, but to go at an equally breakneck pace in the Orange River Colony, then it is of vital and urgent importance—it may make the whole difference between our ultimately retaining or losing South Africa—that you do nothing to hamper the growth of the Transvaal or to alienate the affections of its people.

What is the outlook in that respect to-day? My Lords, I say it with the deepest regret, the outlook is far worse, in my humble opinion, than it was three months ago. Six months ago, three months ago, it looked as if we were through our worst troubles in the Transvaal. The economic crisis was over. Trade returns, railway returns, revenue—every index of the general economic condition of the country—was showing very satisfactory results. The amount paid by the mines in wages and salaries was £1,871,000 more in 1904–5—the first Chinese year—than in 1903–4. The amount paid by them for stores was £821,000 more. The expenditure of this large sum by its immediate recipients was giving a powerful impetus to every industry in the country and to agriculture. The number of whites in profitable employment had enormously increased. The surplus population was almost absorbed, and there would soon have been a demand for further immigration. The reviving prosperity of industry and of agriculture was raising the spirits of the people—and, believe me, there is nothing like common prosperity to soften the asperities of racial rivalry.

Moreover, the improvement radiating from the Transvaal was beginning to make itself felt, as sooner or later it was bound to make itself felt, in every part of South Africa; and, according to the latest returns, Cape Colony and Natal, which had suffered so deeply in consequence of the depression in the central State, were showing unmistakable signs of revival. As compared with that, what is the position to-day? What is the position of the great industry of the Transvaal, the great industry of South Africa, as it has been left by the acts and the declarations of His Majesty's Government? I venture to say it is a position of the most complete, the most harassing, the most paralysing uncertainty. No business could possibly flourish under such conditions; and we have just got to face the fact that the economic development of the Transvaal is definitely stopped. The best we can hope is that things will not go back. There is no chance of their going forward until the menace at present hanging over the colony is removed.

My Lords, if I were to attempt to enter adequately into the discussion of Chinese labour, either on its economic or on its ethical side, I should keep you here till midnight. Moreover, we have now reached a stage in this controversy, which, sooner or later, is reached in every controversy, when no one can any longer hope to make converts. But, if this is not the time for argument, it is a time for a profession of faith. The tide of prejudice is running strongly against this system. That is the more reason why those who believe in it should speak out boldly. I know that I bear a large share of the responsibility for the introduction of Chinese labour. I am not going to apologise for it. I am firmly convinced I was right.

I did not go into this grave business lightly. When it was first suggested, when the question was first raised, I was as much opposed to it as all the rest of the white population of the Transvaal, except a mere handful of mineowners and mine experts, a small minority even of their own class. By what subtle alchemy, by what insidious and subterranean processes does any one suppose that I, together with thousands of our fellow-countrymen out there—men quite as independent, as honest, as moral, as religious, as the average middle class and upper working class of Great Britain, to which they belong—that I and they were converted to take a different view? We were converted by the facts; and if I was converted a little sooner than some of the rest, it was only because I had earlier and fuller access to the facts, and perhaps more time exhaustively to study them.

But let me add that, however great appeared to me its economic necessity, as revealed by the facts, I should never have felt myself justified in recommending the system if I had thought it morally wrong. I disliked the idea of it, because I foresaw that it would give us an enormous amount of trouble, though not precisely the trouble that has arisen, and that it would be difficult to recruit the coolies, to bring them over, to arrange for them on arrival; difficult to house them, difficult on the one hand, to prevent their giving trouble, and, on the other, to protect them against rough usage and against imposition, while the population would have to be protected against outrage. I fully recognised the gravity of all this. These were drawbacks, inconveniences, grave objections, no doubt, but such as with hard work and good administration could all be overcome, as I believe they have been overcome, although, no doubt, some mistakes were made and some very regrettable things happened in the process. These difficulties could not, in my judgment, be allowed to weigh against the supreme need of the country, not of the mines alone, not of the Transvaal alone, but of every industry, of every portion of South Africa—the need of labour. It would have been otherwise if there had been something in the system which appeared to me inherently and incurably wrong. But that I was—and, after reading pages and pages of declamation and of hair-splitting I still am—totally unable to see.

On the ethical side the charge against the system has now been reduced to this, that if you admit the Chinese coolies into the Transvaal at all, you are morally bound to admit them for all time and for all purposes. It seems to me that this is an entirely new moral law invented for the particular occasion. These men are aliens. They have no rights in the country by birth or citizenship. No one disputes that the Transvaal would have a right to exclude them or any other aliens. What is contended is that it has no right to admit aliens for a limited time and a particular object. But it is surely less interference with the freedom of the Chinaman to admit him for a certain time and for a certain purpose than to exclude him altogether. The people of the Transvaal want the Chinese for one purpose only. The Chinese are delighted to come, fully understanding that it is for that purpose only. The purpose itself is a good one. It is labour, arduous and disagreeable labour, no doubt, but still straightforward, honest labour. I say, under these circumstances, it is tyrannous, yes, tyrannous, on the part of the people of this country to prevent the Transvaal people and the Chinese from entering into this arrangement between themselves, and I say that tyranny is immoral.

It has been said, and I sympathise with the remark and with the spirit that animates it, that there is no honest work which British workmen cannot do, and that they could do the work for which the Chinese are brought into the Transvaal, at a certain wage. But the point is that the enterprise cannot afford the wage which British workmen would require, and rightly require. The British workman will not, and ought not, to accept the only wage which for that particular work the mines can afford to pay. It would mean to him degradation. But for the Chinaman, with his different standard of living, this same wage is not degradation, but advancement. And in doing this work which he can do without degradation, though the British workman could not, he is at the same time creating work of a different kind which the British workman can do with advantage. The arrangement is the most reasonable, I might almost say the most providential, which can be imagined; and it seems to me unreasonable, harsh, and tyrannous, both to the Chinaman and to the Briton, to forbid it.

So much about the prospect on its economic side. Now, how about the political? Let me say at once that, even from the political point of view, I attach far more importance to the general prosperity of the Transvaal, to the development of its industry and its agriculture, to making it a great country, the home of thousands of working British people carrying on an ever-increasing trade with their fellow-workers over here—I say I attach more importance to that than to this or that franchise, this or that distribution of seats, always provided you do nothing ludicrously unfair. I thought that in both these respects what is known as the Lyttelton Constitution was a very fair one. I am sorry it has been upset. But I do not say that some other arrangement might not be devised which would be equally fair, though I should not so describe any plan which did not give the young unmarried or newly-married residents, who form so large and important an element in the Transvaal population, and bear so large a part of the burden of taxation, their full share of political power. I should not so describe any plan which involved the total swamping of the small towns. And, fortunately, abstract justice in this respect coincides with political expediency. For it is to the country towns and to the average professional and middle-class and working-class voter of the Rand and of Pretoria that you must look to prevent political power in the colony falling too much under plutocratic influences. The bulk of the country voters will do what "Het Volk" tells them, and "Het Volk" is not going to save you from "Mammon." It is quite as willing to-day as the old Transvaal Government was before the war to make its own bargain with "Mammon." It will go for Chinese labour, or for some bad substitute, such as forced Kaffir labour, which really is "tainted with slavery," if thereby it can only get complete control of the country schools.

There never was a question of this kind, a question of the distribution of political power, more complex and of more far-reaching importance than the present one. But obviously I cannot discuss its details with the noble Earl across the Table to-night. We are in complete ignorance why Mr. Lyttelton's Constitution was rejected, or what the Government are going to put in its place. Probably the Government themselves do not yet know. But what I want particularly to ask is this. Are we never to know until everything is decided? Is this matter to be withdrawn entirely from the cognisance of Parliament and of the country, until we wake up some fine morning and find ourselves in the presence of an accomplished fact, which we may greatly dislike, and there is no room for criticism or even for suggestion? I most sincerely hope that the noble Earl will assure us that that is not going to happen.

The case is entirely different from Mr. Lyttelton's Constitution. That was avowedly temporary and transitional. There would have been plenty of subsequent opportunities to alter and amend it. But this is to be the grant of full responsible government. This country is going to say its last word about the Constitution of the Transvaal and at the same time, perhaps, to give the decisive bent to the whole future of that Colony and of South Africa. That is so grave a step, the issues involved are so momentous, that no Government is justified in taking it without first submitting it to public discussion.

My Lords, I must admit that I look forward to the future with deep concern. I should have spoken perhaps even more strongly, but I have wished not to seem to make a Party attack. My desire is to save our position in South Africa, and not to do anything to injure, to discredit, or to hamper the Government. I am not much of a Party man any way. I have had too long and bitter an experience of the evil effects of Party spirit on those national interests which it has been my duty and privilege, however imperfectly, to serve.

If I were a Party man I should try to goad the Government into going still further than they have done, into completely crippling the industry of the Transvaal, into recasting the electoral system of that colony to the detriment of the British element, into hurrying on full responsible government in the Orange River Colony without any safeguard or precautions; because I feel certain that, while the people of Great Britain may not realise what all this means while it is being done, they will greatly dislike the consequences when the thing has been done, and they will visit with condign punishment those who have done it. If I were a Party man I should rejoice to see the extremists, who have already dragged it so far, run away with the Government coach altogether. But from my point of view the alienation of South Africa is too high a price to pay for another swing of the pendulum at home. For the pendulum may swing backwards and forwards many times, but South Africa once lost will be lost for ever.

*LORD HARRIS rose to ask His Majesty's Government whether the Prime Minister was correctly reported as having at Liverpool, on January 9th, stated that the Government was making an inquiry as to what steps could be taken to remove the "taint of slavery" from Chinese labour; and, if so, what provisions of the Ordinance, or what administrative arrangements on the mines, justified the expression "taint of slavery."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I should explain that I rise now to address your Lordships at the request of the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order that he may have the opportunity of replying to the points raised in my Questions at the same time as he deals with those which have been addressed to your Lordship by the noble Viscount who has just sat down. I feel that it is inevitable that in addressing you upon the particular points contained in my Question the level of the debate must come down somewhat. The subjects with which the noble Viscount has dealt so earnestly and so exhaustively are of the highest Imperial order, whereas those with which I ask leave to trouble your Lordships refer merely to some of the points which serve to build up that portion of the Empire with which the noble Viscount has been dealing. But I hope it needs from me no apology for asking your Lordships to listen to me to-night. You have been on more than one occasion very lenient in allowing me, only a humble director of a company, to address you upon this subject; but I do so because I feel that I am representing the interests of tens of thousands of shareholders, many of them very poor.

It is not my business to protect millionaires and magnates. They can very well protect themselves; but it is legitimate, I think, to ask your Lordships to listen to me on behalf of the shareholders in these companies which I have the privilege of representing. I shall endeavour in the first instance, in elaborating the Questions which I put to the noble Earl, to show that England feels at this moment so strongly, because she has been in a great measure misled and mis-instructed; and, next, I wish to ascertain from the noble Earl what it is, specifically, that the Government object to in what is being done at this moment under the Ordinance in the Transvaal. The first Question I ask is whether the Prime Minister used a particular expression—the "taint of slavery." When I put this Question on the Paper there had not been a debate in the House of Commons, and I was not aware that one was coming on; but I understand that in the course of that debate the Prime Minister did acknowledge that he used the expression "taint of slavery."

When putting down this question I thought it only just to the Prime Minister to look up what "taint" means, and I find that Dr. Johnson defines it as a spot. a stain, a soil, a blemish. I rather gathered from the explanation of the Prime Minister that he thought the first word in the sentence was a qualification of the last. I must say I cannot see that to call a system the stain of slavery, the soil of slavery, the blemish of slavery helps him at all; and I am perfectly certain of this, that many of those hundreds who heard the Prime Minister use that expression, and many of the thousands who read the expression, and possibly the hundreds of thousands who have heard that he used it, did not draw any distinction between stain of slavery and slavery. His Majesty's Ministers seem to me now to be searching about in every direction for qualifications of those words and expressions which they used before the General Election. The other night the noble Earl opposite, the Lord President of the Council, told us, I think, that it was an explanatory expression——

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): I think I used the phrase, "a descriptive term."

*LORD HARRIS: There is a useful letter in *The Times* of this morning recalling the expressions which Ministers used before the Elections. I find that Mr. Morley described the Chinamen as chattels. A chattel, I suppose, is something that can be sold; and when the people of this country have seen illustrations of Chinamen in chains and heard them described, by an ex-Minister of the Crown and a Statesman who is now a Minister, as a chattel, it would not be unreasonable if a good many of them inferred that these Chinamen could be sold as African slaves used to be in the United States, before the war. Lord Spencer, whose absence we all deplore, and with whom, in his illness, we deeply sympathise, described the Chinamen as confined in cages; Mr. Lloyd-George spoke of them as chained in compounds, and Mr. Burns referred to the system as slavery naked and unabashed. Mr. Burns, at any rate, is not afraid of the expressions he uses. The noble Marquess the Leader of this House, whose absence I deplore to-night as I particularly wanted to put a Question to him, is reported to have said, on 11th February, 1904—

"The conditions under which these people would live would really amount to pure slavery."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): No. That is denied by my noble friend.

*LORD HARRIS: Well, I have taken it from *The Times*. The statement is said to have been made by the noble Marquess on February 11th, 1904. If he did not use it, I apologise to him. He did say the other night that he had never used the expression slavery himself, and I was surprised to see this sentence attributed to him. But what I desire to point out is that all these expressions, which there is no doubt were used before the election, are now being qualified. Perhaps I may be allowed to read two letters which illustrate the anxiety which existed on the part of the Radical Party to get hold of any expression, any description by which they might agitate the minds of the people. These are letters which passed on the eve of the New Forest Election. The first was addressed to the Radical candidate—

"It is reported that the managers of the South African gold mines, or some of them, in order to lessen the cost of meat, which in South Africa is dear and tough, have caused to be extracted the teeth of the Chinese labourers. Will you, if elected, undertake to bring in a short Bill compelling the mine owners to put false teeth in the place of those wrongfully extracted."

Your Lordships laugh. Yes; it would be humorous if not altogether so pathetic that anyone standing for Parliament should display such gullibility and such greed for an opportunity for the dissemination of imaginary horrors. This is the reply which was sent—

"Sir Robert Hobart presents his compliments to Mr. So-and-so and, in reply to his postcard just received reporting an almost incredible piece of barbarity to Chinese workmen in South Africa, desires to say that if the writer will be good enough to send him some more details or reference to the report he will at once forward the case to the Secretary of State for the Colonies as the swiftest and most effective manner of dealing with an inhuman action."

My Lords, the Radical Party have had the advantage of declamation from church and from chapel. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Hereford has not hesitated to describe his reverend brethren in the Transvaal, the ministers of religion there, as persons with a lower sense of patriotism, of humanity, of Christianity than the right rev. Prelate himself. Why? They are men of the same blood and the same birth. Why should he, with, I venture to think, little of that spirit of charity which is enjoined on us by St. Paul, find fault with these gentlemen who, far away from the luxury of palaces and cathedrals, are struggling their best to extend Christianity to the black race indigenous to the colony and to the yellow race which has been introduced there? It seems to me that the right rev. Prelate might have taken the trouble to ascertain the truth with regard to the Ordinance, and the system under which it is being worked, before bringing charges of this kind against men as honourable as any in the Church.

I have said that the Chapel had also assisted the Radical Party. There is a red pamphlet being sold on every railway platform in England, entitled, "John Chinaman on the Rand; by an Eyewitness." On the outside of it there is a picture of a Chinaman manacled, with chains on his legs, and tied to a post, and in the distance, at the pit-head, are Chinamen being flogged. I cannot help thinking that that pamphlet was written by a certain Mr. Pless. I do not know whether your Lordships have studied this Blue-book, but at page 21 you will find a very terrible story. On that page is Lord Selborne's despatch dealing with the whole thing, and you will find that he refers to a Mr. Boland who had written some description of the ill-treatment of the Chinese. Lord Selborne says—

"From the acting manager's letter you will see that there can be no doubt that Mr. Boland's informant is a Mr. H. J. Pless, who was at one time Chinese compound manager on this mine, but who has since left the service of the Company, and has returned to China. I will add nothing to the acting manager's letter and affidavit, and to the affidavit by the hospital attendant at the mine. These documents are a sufficient refutation of Mr. Boland's charges so far as they concern the management of the mine."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): Will the noble Lord give us the number of the Blue-book from which he is quoting?

*LORD HARRIS: I am quoting from the last Blue-book—the one in continuation of [Cd. 2788] January, 1906. On page 30 Your Lordships will find an affidavit of Alexander James McCarthy, hospital attendant at the Nourse Deep, Ltd., Chinese Hospital, to the following effect—

"(1.) I joined the service of the Nourse Deep, Limited, as hospital attendant, on 27th April, 1905, and have worked at the hospital since that date.

"(2.) I have never admitted a coolie who was suffering from the effects of flogging.

"(3.) I have never admitted a coolie who was suffering from the effects of torture, such as being strung up by the wrists.

"(4.) On or about the 10th June, 1905, at which time I was boarding with Mr. H. J. Pless, the Company's Chinese Controller, at his house on the Nourse Deep, Limited, he took a photograph of a Chinese coolie in the following circumstances: I do not know whether the coolie had committed any offence, but Pless said, 'I will make an example of this fellow, and I will photograph him tied up, for fun,' or words to this effect. He then first gave the coolie a cold water bath, followed by a hot water bath. I objected to this from a medical point of view as liable to give the man pneumonia. He then tied the coolie, stripped naked, by his wrists to two large nails on the door in his dining-room, tied his pigtail up to his hands, and then tied his feet. Whilst he was tied up Pless brought food at meal hours and placed it on a chair in front of the coolie where it was impossible for him to get it. Pless kept the coolie tied up from 7 o'clock at night until 11.15 a.m. the following morning, and then released him and allowed him to return into the compound. The same coolie was admitted by me into the hospital, some three days afterwards, suffering from influenza, which I consider was brought on by the cold and hot baths.

"I remonstrated with Pless on his action on this occasion, but did not report same to the manager.

"To the best of my knowledge and belief no one else saw the coolie tied up in Pless's dining-room.

"Pless sent the photograph he took to some place in town to be developed; I tried to find out where, but he evidently did not wish me to know.

"(5.) Pless remarked to me on one occasion that the photographs he had taken would be useful to him on his return to China, and that he would make something out of them; further, that he intended writing a book—with the photographs for illustrations—on 'Slave driving on the Rand.'"

Now this book, which, as I have described to your Lordships, is to be found on every railway platform in England, contains prints of a Chinaman hanging by his wrists from a nail in a door; and I do not think it is a very extravagant assumption on my part to believe that this book was produced by Mr. Pless.

Now, the reason why I say that the Radical Party have had the support of chapel as well as church is that this book is godfathered by Dr. Clifford. He has written a preface to it, without apparently taking any trouble whatever to ascertain whether the statements contained in the book were correct or not. There are, in the book, quotations from Mr. Boland, whom Lord Selborne has described in the words I have read. Am I not entitled, then, to say that the Radical Party have had the support both of church and of chapel? This is not the first time that slavery in the Transvaal has been discussed in your Lordships' House. I remember twenty-five years ago a very remarkable and memorable speech delivered by Lord Cairns after Majuba, in the course of which he pointed out that serious allegations against the Boer people as regards slavery had been made by the Press in South Africa. He quoted this from the *Cape Argus*—

> "The Republic has acted in contravention of the Sand River Convention."

I fancy His Majesty's Government are going to place a great deal of dependence on the Sand River Convention and the Conventions that follow it—

> "And slavery has occurred as an unbroken practice. It has been at the root of most of its wars; it has been carried on regularly, even in times of peace."

Lord Cairns pointed out that there were from 500,000 to 600,000 Kaffirs in the Transvaal, and he charged the Ministry of the day—the Liberal Ministry of the day—with handing back to a people against whom this accusation was brought, these 500,000 or 600,000 Kaffirs, with the risk of their being subjected to slavery. Where was the virtuous indignation of the Liberal Party then? Not a word; and if we had then agitated the country on that particular point, do not you think that the Liberal Party would have been very indignant? Are we not justified in being indignant that you have brought these charges against us?

As I said just now, the ministers of religion in the Transvaal are of the same race and blood as yourselves. They take just as great a pride as you do in the great part that England has played in the abolition of the slave trade and in the suppression of slavery; yet before the election some of you were not reluctant to use expressions which brought the gravest charges against them as regards their humanity and their pride in what England had done in this respect. There are a good many people not very significant who may use expressions without our taking much notice of them, but when the Prime Minister of England uses an expression one assumes that he has done so deliberately; and when he used the expression "taint of slavery," it seemed to me that it could not be denied that the Radical Party had brought a most odious charge against a number of people who were absolutely innocent of the slightest idea of favouring, encouraging, or patronising any system of slavery, of serfdom, or of servile conditions. If it could be disproved that any of those conditions existed, we were justified in expecting either an explanation why the term was used or an expression of regret that it ever had been used.

I pass on to the next point. I trust the noble Earl will be able to give your Lordships to-night a specific and clear explanation of what it is in this Ordinance that the Government take exception to. I will take the liberty of going through one or two points. One descriptive word has been used constantly—"compound." Are your Lordships aware that the word "compound" does not come into the Ordinance at all? The word is "estate" or "property," and the compound is only a walled-in portion of the estate of the mining companies partly for purposes of protection against the violent winds of the Transvaal and partly as protection from attack from some other estate. The Kaffirs, who entirely manned the mines before the Chinese came, were very fond, on a holiday or on a Sunday, of raiding a neighbouring compound if they could, and the compound fence, a very substantial fence, was an excellent protection against these raids. The necessity for a compound at the Kimberley mines was absolutely different from the necessity on the Gold Mines in the Transvaal. The compound at the Kimberley mines is required because diamonds are very small, easily concealed, and very valuable objects, and it was necessary to have an opportunity of examining the Kaffirs before they left the compound to prevent illicit diamond trading. But the Kaffir has no opportunity of stealing gold on the Rand, and the compound there is not for the purpose of confinement so much as for the purpose of protection. Anyhow, the term is not used at all in the Ordinance and the Chinaman has perfect liberty, under the Ordinance, to wander about the estate of the particular company. Therefore, I cannot conceive that that is the objection taken to the Ordinance.

Now, as regards compulsory repatriation, one must consider the whole of the circumstances. The Chinaman is recruited in China on the condition that at the end of his term of service, or after his term of re-engagement has expired, he shall return to China. Do you say that he is not a free man, that he is not entitled to make an engagement of that kind? Do you say that he does not understand what he is doing? All I can say is that if the British official—not the official of the mine-owners, but the Consul at the port—does not satisfy himself that the man understands the contract into which he enters, then he is not doing his duty. It is the business of the Government to see that each man who is recruited does know the contract into which he enters. It seems to me an astounding proposition to advance that these men, members of a race who wander all over the world, and who are shrewd enough in many of their commercial dealings to look after themselves, are not to be free to make an engagement of that kind. If that is the objection, I am very much afraid the Government are going to find themselves in a very serious dilemma, because the Portuguese Government have already stipulated, or are about to stipulate, that the very same thing should be done with Portuguese Kaffirs. As your Lordships probably know, of the Kaffirs employed on the Rand something like 67 to 70 per cent. are from Portuguese territory. They are not British subjects, and the Portuguese Government have recently stipulated—it may have been carried out by now for all I know—that they will only allow recruiting in Portuguese territory on condition that at the end of the third year, or, if he re-engages, at the end of the fifth year, the Kaffir should be returned to Portuguese territory, and not be allowed to take up other work in the Transvaal. Are we to understand that not only are you going to interfere so seriously with Chinese labour that the Transvaal will not be able to get it, but that you are also, out of consistency, going to interfere with the recruiting of Kaffir labour from Portuguese territory? This is a doubly serious question for those who have invested their money, their small fortunes, in these properties.

Is the objection to the Ordinance that the Chinese cannot own property? There are plenty of instances where aliens may not own property. Such is the case in certain States in the United States of America, and the Indian civilian who goes to India for the best part of his life is not allowed to own landed property there. There are several cases in other countries where aliens may not own property. What is the suggestion? That you are going to force the Chinaman, in order to own property, to become a British subject when he goes to the Transvaal! You will be landing yourselves in curious complications in taking objections of this kind to the Ordinance. It seems to me that the real reason which has animated such a large number of the people of this country is an extreme dislike of the industry because it is gold that is being abstracted. I am certain that if it were steam-coal we should not hear one-half of the objections now raised. You take objection because these men are not allowed to engage in other occupations. Why, it is a common form of agreement in the case of the highest employees that they should not enter into any other business but that of their employers. Is the objection that they have to reside on a particular property? There is the same provision on the British Guiana Ordinance. Is it that they have to carry passes? Why, every Kaffir has to carry passes. How would you identify him if found dead on the veldt otherwise? They are treated exactly the same as the Kaffir in that respect. I hope the noble Earl will be able to tell us plainly what are the points in the Ordinance to which he objects, in view of the remarkable difference in the tone adopted by the Government on Friday from that of the night before.

Now, my Lords, what are you going to do? You are not going to have an inquiry, I understand. I am very sorry to hear it. When I saw that the Prime Minister had said that they were going to make inquiry how to remove this taint of slavery I was extremely hopeful that it meant that there would be a Royal Commission. You do make inquiries, apparently, of some people—anonymous magnates, and faddists. As I have said, it is not my business to defend the magnates. Those whom I do represent desire inquiries, but not of those of whom the Under-Secretary appears to make inquiries. What we want is a public inquiry upon oath, conducted by an impartial body, who shall go into the whole economic questions in South Africa, ascertain whether or not there is coloured labour enough, whether or not European labour will work alongside black labour, whether or not if they would not many of the mines could afford white labour, and whether or not this alien labour is necessary and as to the conditions under which it has been carried out.

I do implore His Majesty's Ministers not to discard this humble prayer of mine. I advance it most earnestly for this reason. I complain that the people of this country have been entirely misled as to the nature of the system under the Ordinance, and as to the provisions of the Ordinance. It is no use those who are concerned in the mines saying a word. It is no use noble Lords and their colleagues on the Front Opposition Bench saying a word. They are not believed. But an impartial inquiry by a Royal Commission would, I am perfectly convinced, show the people of this country how very much they have been misled, and how very unnecessarily their indignation has been aroused. I do most earnestly beg the noble Earl to consider this prayer of mine, and, if possible, to convince his colleagues that it will be to the benefit of South Africa and of England that an inquiry of that kind should be held.

I am sure it is better than going to the people whom the Under-Secretary goes to. He has been to Mr. Creswell. I can tell your Lordships something about the Association which has been formed, and which is called the Chinese Ordinance Repeal League. The Members include Mr. Creswell, Mr. Wybergh, and Mr. Edwards. Mr. Creswell was a very capable engineer, but, unfortunately, he had a bee in his bonnet. He was allowed to run one of the mines after the war, when there was a large number of indigent whites in South Africa, entirely with white labour, and at the end of six months or more—I forget how long, but it was after a fair trial—the chief engineer of the company, a very much more experienced engineer, said to him, in effect—

> "Well, I am very sorry I cannot allow you to go on; the mine is not paying, and this experiment must cease."

It was accordingly put a stop to, and ever since then Mr. Creswell has had a grievance. It is his mission, he thinks, in this world to convince the general public, which is perhaps not very difficult, and to convince men of his own profession, which is absolutely impossible, that his attempt on this particular mine was a success, when the best engineers on the Rand can prove quite easily that it was an entire failure. Mr. Creswell is one of the people whom the Under-Secretary consults. He told us so the other night.

Then there is Mr. Wybergh. He was also an engineer under a company of which I am chairman. He is, I believe, a fair engineer. He also has a fad, and his fad is politics. Just before the war he was taking an active part in agitating against President Kruger's Government. When I joined this company, of which I am now Chairman, having had nothing whatever to do with anything that had preceded the Raid, I gave my promise to President Kruger that the company should take no part whatever in politics, and I cabled out to Mr. Wybergh that he must make his choice between the company and politics. He chose politics. He was justified, of course, in doing so; and he was subsequently made Commissioner of Mines in the Transvaal. After being in that office for about a year he retired—and I believe it was a matter of pretty general knowledge that he retired because otherwise his services would have been dispensed with —and he has now got a grievance against the company and the Government. The third name I mentioned was that of Mr. Edwards, and he, unless I am entirely misinformed, is a renegade Britisher, who fought against us during the war. This is the association which the Under-Secretary has been consulting.

I venture to suggest to the noble Earl, who, I am certain, has not implicated himself with insignificant people of this kind, that a very much safer course is to obtain information in the Transvaal itself on oath by an impartial body whom the people of this country will entirely trust. What is it that you are going to do? The Government are going to interfere, I understand, with the disciplinary regulations of the mines. I hope it will turn out all right. You must quite understand that the managers of these mines are persons who have had great experience in discipline and in the control of large bodies of men. I can quite understand the Government feeling it necessary to make these changes. I only warn them that if the changes are made, and if agitation results among the men, the managers will be far more free from responsibility than they are now. It is just a question whether it is not better to throw the whole responsibility on the managers.

The other thing you are going to do, I understand, is to offer to repatriate the Chinese. You are going to offer them the cost of their passage home; that is to say, you are coming between master and servant, and offering the servant an inducement to break his contract with his master. That would be called by another name, legal or commercial, in this country. But I am very hopeful, for the sake of the mines, that there are not many Chinese who are going to accept this offer. I see on page 107 that Mr. Jameson, the protector of the Chinese—he is not an official of the mining companies—has expressed a certain opinion on this matter. Lord Selborne says, in his despatch—

> "The Superintendent of Foreign Labour expresses the opinion that the high sense of the binding nature of a written contract entertained by the Chinese would deter many coolies from expressing a desire to break their contracts."

In the speech to which I have already referred, Lord Cairns concluded with these lines—

> "In all the ills we ever bore
> We grieved, we sighed, we wept,
> We never blushed before."

Which is the more calculated to raise a blush—that England should desert those whom she had promised to help, or that a British Ministry should have to be taught what is the honourable character of a contract by some poor Chinese coolies?

I have not gone into the economic part of the question to-night. I shall venture to ask your Lordships to allow me to do so on another occasion. I wish to show your Lordships how justifiable has been the action of those who have insisted that alien labour was necessary, not merely for the mines, but for the progress of the country, and it is necessary, in order to bring that home to conviction, to deal at considerable length with the economic side of the question. All I do now is to ask the Questions standing in my name, and I put it to your Lordships whether I have not fairly shown that expressions were used by persons of the highest authority which must have had a very great effect on the minds of many voters in this country—the effect of raising an excited animosity against the Ordinance and the system of labour brought into operation under it. I ask the noble Earl to tell us what it is in the system which is really objected to. Noble Lords opposite have the power now; they have the opportunity, and can make or break South Africa; but I am certain of this, that England does not easily forgive one or two things. She does not easily forgive if she has been misled, and she does not easily forgive if she finds that she is being done injustice; and I think you will find that there are hundreds of thousands of poor people who have invested their small savings in these mines who will think that your offer to our servants to leave our service without any compensation is inflicting upon them a very grave injustice.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will admit that it is no easy task to follow the noble

Viscount who introduced this subject. He is not only responsible for much of the policy which His Majesty's Government have not been able to accept, but he is, also, master of all the details which have been impressed upon his memory during a time of stress and anxiety, in which he showed a courage and devotion which his country will not forget. My noble friend also who spoke from the other side has made himself a master of the details of the mining industry, and I thank him for the moderation with which, on the whole, he has spoken. I can assure him that I appreciate entirely the anxiety which he feels; and I think he will believe me when I say that I do not think any one holding the office which I now have the honour to hold could overlook the fact that the prosperity of the Transvaal is indissolubly connected with the mining industry, nor do I think that any reasonable man could deny that the small investors of whom the noble Lord has spoken have a claim for consideration, and have always received consideration, from the British Government.

The noble Lord has challenged me with regard to the use of terms connected with slavery. I can only follow my noble friends who spoke on this subject on the occasion of the Address and decline to take any responsibility for the use of that term. I have always declined, as far as I could, to take any responsibility for the creation of these general terms. I never had much to do with election placards, but it always seemed to me that, in the endeavour to get a single word which was capable of being represented in large letters on a single sheet of paper, those who drew up those placards ran a risk of doing a grave injustice. It is not the first time on which these sort of terms have been used. There are many in our recollection; and I confess I rather regretted to hear the noble Viscount bring into this discussion to-day a term which has had the same sort of misleading interpretation attached to it —I mean the term pro-Boer.

But I must call your Lordships' attention to one instance of how easily these things are misrepresented. The noble Lord opposite quoted some words which he said had been used by Lord Ripon, who is not able, through illness, to be in his place this evening. May I tell him how that speech reads in the pages of *Hansard*?—

> "The system which it is proposed to establish is one of semi-slavery. There is no other term to be applied to it. I am afraid I shall incur the censure of Lord Milner for having made that statement. . . . It is not pure slavery, because it is preceded by what is supposed to be consent on the part of the parties who are to be emigrated, but, once they are in South Africa, if they are not slaves, at least they are prisoners, for they are not to be allowed out except under stringent regulations and with a possibility of being arrested at every turn."

As to pictorial representations, the art of political caricature, in the hand of a master, fascinates the victim even while it attacks him. In other hands it becomes a bludgeon which is as likely to injure friend as foe. I wish to express my deep regret—I have no hesitation in using that word—that this term has been used, for two particular reasons. In the first place, I regret exceedingly to find that men who have fought for us and suffered for us in the colony should think that their personal honour is impugned. I cannot believe that any reasonable man, even in the heat of an election contest, ever meant anything of the kind. But if he did, it only shows how important it is in these matters to observe the rule that, while we may challenge any system, we are not entitled to condemn an individual except on clear and specific proof. In the second place, I especially regret this incident, because it might possibly seem to raise a suspicion that there was a difference of opinion between the two sides of the House and the two Parties of the country on the great question of slavery itself. I do not believe that for a moment. I believe that all Parties adhere to the proud boast that slavery cannot exist under the British flag.

If we are agreed so far, it comes to a question, which surely may be discussed with calmness, whether under this Ordinance there is anything which interferes with the liberty of a free man. I may be wrong, but I cannot conceive that anybody could say that all the provisions of this Ordinance were consistent with that right. I think the noble Lord used the argument that the Chinamen had consented to go. I do not think that the voluntary consent of Chinamen to come under the Ordinance is a sufficient answer. I do not know whether it has ever happened, but I can conceive a man's becoming a slave voluntarily for certain reasons of his own. It is significant that the differences from the ordinary law are exactly the points at which the difficulties make themselves most manifest.

I wish to call your Lordships' attention, from the Blue-book last published, to the returns of offences for October last. The return is given under several heads, and the figures are given for each head. But they are not summed up, so I may mention that the total number of offences recorded in October, 1905, is 940. Of these no less than 755 come under two sections of the Ordinance, and as this matter is of importance I should like, with your Lordships' permission, to read those sections. Subsection 11 of Section 31 provides that—

> "Any labourer who shall desert from the service of his importer, or shall refuse to work for him when required to do so, or who shall unlawfully absent himself from work, or who shall perform any work or carry on any business other than that of unskilled labour in the exploitation of minerals, or who shall enter the service of any person other than that of the person importing him, or of the person to whom his contract has been lawfully transferred under this Ordinance, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £25, and in default of payment to imprisonment for a period not exceeding two months."

*LORD HARRIS: Is that the British Guiana Ordinance?

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: No; it is the South African Ordinance.

*LORD HARRIS: I thought it was the other; it is so much like it.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: Section 19 provides that—

> "No labourer introduced under this Ordinance shall leave the premises on which he is employed without a permit in the form and containing the particulars prescribed by regulation signed by some person authorised thereto by the importer, provided that no such permit shall authorise the absence of such labourer from such premises for more than 48 hours from the time when it was issued."

I am informed that those sections cannot be found in the ordinary law. They create crimes which are not crimes under the ordinary law, and, in my opinion, that does constitute a difference from the point of true liberty which every free man ought to possess under the British flag.

The noble Lord also challenged me in regard to the section relating to repatriation. He seemed to think it was ridiculous to call that section an infringement of the ordinary law, because all that was provided was that the man should go home. But there is a good deal more than that in the section. It imposes a penalty if the labourer refuses to return to his country of origin—a fine of £10, or three months' imprisonment. If he pays the fine or serves the term of imprisonment and still refuses, he is to be forcibly sent back. Surely that is not within the ordinary description of the rights and liberties of a free man. I have said I do not wish to support any of the allegations or attacks upon individuals. But where there is a question of limiting liberty—which liberty is the right of every man who lands on British soil who is not a criminal—there we object, and we must continue to object.

We do not propose, and I do not think we can be called upon—there are plenty of precedents for our not doing so—to sweep away all that we object to at one moment. We recognise that that would be grievously injurious to the industries, and we are not called upon to do it. It is admitted that there have been irregularities in the past, especially with regard to flogging. That certainly did not come within the Ordinance; it was specially debarred at the request of the Chinese Ambassador, and it ought not to have occurred. I do not mean to say that there has not been exaggeration in the accounts given of this matter —and in regard to the gentleman of the name of Pless, to whom the noble Lord referred, very likely he is culpable for misrepresentation at least. We desired that he should be prosecuted, but he had left the country and gone back to China, and it is not very clear that we can get hold of him.

We are now in this position, that I have the personal assurance of Lord Selborne that he has gone into the whole of this matter, and he is satisfied that he has secured humane treatment for the workmen in the mines. I have not the honour of personal acquaintance with Lord Selborne, but Lord Selborne's character is known in this House and the country. I think we should always say that any work which he has done is thorough and conscientious; and during his time in South Africa all accounts show that he has made himself personally accessible and popular to men of every race and class. I feel that I am perfectly justified in accepting the assurance of Lord Selborne in the spirit in which it is offered.

The noble Lord asked me whether it would not be well to appoint a Commission to inquire into this subject. My Lords, if it is true, as I think it is, that under the action of the High Commissioner irregularities have been removed and things are working in a satisfactory manner, I rather doubt the expediency of raking up the scandals of the past. Well, I am talking of the action of the Government. But in the meantime, I do not think the noble Lord quite gathered what it is that we propose to do with regard to amendments of procedure.

In the amending Ordinance of October last it was arranged that the coolies should be tried by the inspectors with a knowledge of Chinese instead of by the ordinary magistrate, and that they should have a right to hold these trials within the precincts of the mines. It was also enacted that certain penalties should be enforced that were new. We think that while it may be an advantage, and very likely is an advantage, that the coolie should be tried by a man who knows his language, and therefore can both understand the coolie and makes himself intelligible to him, still these trials should not be held in any private place but should be held with all the publicity of a Court. From the last information we have received from the High Commissioner I believe that these inspectors, though they were inexperienced at first, have now gathered a sufficient amount of experience to make them capable of conducting a fair trial. If that is so, I do not see why that system should not be continued. With regard to the penalties, I will not go into them in detail, but they were taken exception to by my predecessor and we always objected to them. As a matter of fact, only one of them has been imposed four times. In these circumstances I do not think it will cause any grievous injury to the mines management if they are discontinued.

The noble Lord spoke of the question of repatriation. I am inclined—I do not know whether to say "to expect" or "to hope" with him that the number of coolies who may accept this assistance will not be large. At any rate I may say that, if the view of the mines management is correct, if the coolies are really treated in the humane and almost fatherly manner which they tell us, I cannot see why they should wish to go. At the same time, it must be remembered that the coolie can go at present at any time if he pays the cost of his journey, which amounts to £17 10s. All we propose is that, if a case should occur, and if after full inquiry and due notice it is found that, owing to any particular cause, a man has not the money to defray the whole of the cost of his passage and he has a genuine wish to go, he should not be prevented from doing so. I venture to think, without taking any responsibility on my shoulders for using the expression, a provision of that kind removes so far from the system the taint of slavery.

There are some further points I must touch upon. I have been speaking of what we consider necessary for the present, and you will remember that I prefaced my remarks by saying that we did object, and shall object, to infringement of the principles we consider should be incorporated in the Ordinance. As to the future, my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has explained in a lucid manner in the other House what it is we consider ought to be done, and I may summarise it in this way. We have every hope and expectation that before long the Transvaal will, with a freely elected Legislature and with responsible government, be able to express an opinion as to this labour. We do not think they ought to be asked to vote on such a question under any misunderstanding. The conditions of the Ordinance have received the sanction of the Imperial Government, and the Transvaal has a right to know before they vote whether they can continue the system. If, with the knowledge before them that we must object to the conditions as they now stand, they still vote for the introduction of Asiatic labour, I conceive it would be the bounden duty of His Majesty's Government to endeavour to adjust conditions satisfactory to both parties; but it will also undoubtedly equally be their duty not to shrink from advising His Majesty to exercise his right of veto if that effort failed, or if in their judgment the right of freedom in any part of the Empire was infringed.

I would say a word or two on the position in which His Majesty's Government found themselves when assuming office. The noble Marquess the other day reproached us with want of continuity. I do not know whether he meant upon this particular branch or in relations with the Transvaal as a whole. I am rather prepared to argue that in this matter there is no want of continuity. In the history of Chinese labour the changes of opinion have been rapid and pronounced. Only eight years ago, in 1898, the Transvaal expressed a distinct opinion adverse to Chinese labour; but I will not dwell upon that; the war has intervened, and we then had a different state of matters. But only three years ago the right hon. Gentleman, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, paid a visit to South Africa, and, in the course of a speech he made at Johannesburg, he said—

> "It is not until you have exhausted these solutions which are the nearest to you that it would be reasonable that you should turn to that other more drastic remedy of introducing Asiatic labour. I know that at present the suggestion has not gone beyond ordinary conversation; it has not been developed or fully considered; but just think of the difficulties you will have to overcome. In the first place, it is clear to me—and no doubt to you—that an overwhelming popular opinion in this very colony is opposed to any solution of that kind. You have first to convert them. Then you will have seen that the other great colonies of the Empire and the opinion of the Mother Country herself regard a step of the kind as retrograde and dangerous; and, lastly, if these difficulties were removed, there are serious practical obstacles in the way which will meet you at the outset, and which, I think, will justify my opinion that it would be very long indeed before—even if all other difficulties were removed—you would obtain any reliable supply from the sources which have been suggested."

On 31st March, 1903, Sir G. Farrar, on his return from the Bloemfontein Conference, addressed a meeting of miners and residents of the East Rand and advocated the introduction of Asiatic labour under restrictions; but on the following day there was a mass meeting organised by what was known as the White League, and by the extraordinary majority of 5,000 to 2 the following resolution was passed—

> "We pledge ourselves to prevent by every means in our power the carrying into effect of the proposal for the introduction of Asiatics to work in the mines and other industries of the Transvaal."

Now, I think it is interesting to note, in passing, that Mr. Chamberlain seems still to adhere to the declaration he promulgated on the occasion I have referred to, for, on December 30, he referred to the statement and said—

> "I have not swerved an atom from that policy."

In 1904 very different counsels prevailed. I need not go into detail, the noble Viscount has stated it in a nutshell. He said both to-night and also in the telegram which he sent at the time, that he found that the evidence given before the Labour Commission showed that in no other way could the required labour be provided, and I admit that there followed thereupon a very remarkable change of opinion in the Transvaal. But I do not admit that the other conditions laid down by Mr. Chamberlain have in any way been met; there are still the opinions of the great colonies, New Zealand, Australia, and the Cape, in objection; and as to public opinion in this country, well, of course, it was obscured for a time, but I think that the result of the General Election can leave no doubt of what that opinion is. I do not wish to press the point, but I do wish to express a doubt if the late Government embarked on the policy with any clear idea of the ultimate result. One thing seems clear, that they professed to be trying an experiment. The noble Marquess who then led this House said, on February 12, 1904—

> "We do not propose to resort to that expedient lightheartedly or because we desire what has been called an indiscriminate influx

> of Asiatics. But we are prepared to try the experiment on a limited scale and fenced in by every precaution which experience can suggest."

A few days afterwards his colleague, Mr. Lyttelton, in the other House, said—

> "In British Columbia, as in this case, I believe the necessity was temporary, and needed to give a basis to an industry which, when formed, the outside labour could be dispensed with. In Africa you want to underpin a temporary structure and afterwards to fill in the foundations from the ordinary source of supply."

On March 21, Lord Selborne, speaking in this House, said—

> "I do realise how the working population of the colony feel that they cannot, in the long run, compete with the Chinaman as a labourer. But for that reason, is it, therefore, wrong to use the Chinaman temporarily for a definite limited purpose?"

It is interesting to ask, what is the meaning of experiment? I should imagine there would be some limit of time or money, and these references may be said to contain some vague suggestions, and confine the experiment to modest proportions. I gather from the dictionary that experiment is—

> "A method or course of action adopted in uncertainty whether it will answer the purpose,"

and I find that definition followed by the illustration from Bacon—

> "It is good not to try experiments in States."

But passing on to 1905, I find that on February 15th Mr. Balfour, answering in debate a Question from the present Prime Minister, whether a limit of numbers had been fixed, or when the experiment would end, said—

> "No limit has been placed upon it, but the experiment of using Chinese labour is being most carefully watched by the responsible authorities on the spot, and if it should be found that the immigration of these labourers from any point of view was, on the whole, producing a balance of ill, the right hon. Gentleman may rest assured that we without hesitation should prevent any augmentation of their numbers."

A little later Mr. Lyttelton said—

> "I am not prepared to set a limit as suggested, but I understand that the present requirements of the mines are for no more than 55,000 Chinese, and that after that number has been introduced the rates of increase, if increase there be, will be very moderate. The experiment and all its consequences have received and are receiving the closest attention of the Transvaal Government and His Majesty's Government."

The number 55,000 is important. It is evidently taken from the report of Mr. Evans, the Superintendent of Mines, and represents what Mr. Lyttelton understood to be required in order to fill up the gap "in underpinning the structure."

If this experiment was a reality, if Mr. Lyttelton's understanding of it was real, it appears to me there were two alternatives open to the Government at that time. In the first place they might have defined the limits distinctly and instructed the Lieutenant-Governor to regulate the licences accordingly; or, if they did not choose to do that, they should themselves have assumed some control over the issue of licences and secured reports from South Africa to enable them to do so. They did neither of these things. The only thing that was done at that time was that at the end of a telegram on other matters, a pious opinion was expressed to the effect that it would be good policy for the mineowners voluntarily to suspend the importation for six months. But it unfortunately happened that at that precise moment a large number of licences were issued, as many as 16,000. I maintain that, although it might have been more prudent for the authorities in South Africa to have communicated with His Majesty's Government when they found this large number of licences wanted, still the real responsibility of this matter rested with the Government at home, because they did not adopt one of the alternatives of which I have spoken. It does not seem to me to be fair treatment of your representatives at a distance if, when you come to a point at which an experiment you have been making reaches its limit, you should not distinctly instruct those agents how they are to act.

I am not surprised that the mineowners are under a little misunderstanding. I quite appreciate the position of these mining managers. Any one who has seen anything of mineral operations will know that no mine manager can open out new seams, or can sink deep fittings, without some knowledge that when the opening-out operations are complete he will have a sufficient labour supply to carry on the business. I am not surprised, therefore, that the mine managers should look ahead; but the telegram which was sent on December 30th, came as somewhat of a surprise. It showed quite clearly that the mine-owners had been estimating ahead, and I need only adduce one sentence—

> "All arrangements have been made with a view to a continuous flow of immigration from China being established on permanent basis."

Well, my Lords, what becomes of the "experiment"? It was exactly at this moment that His Majesty's present Government came in; and when I said that I thought in this particular there was not that lack of continuity of which the noble Marquess complained, I think I was justified, and the Government were justified, in what they did. We honoured all the Bills of the late Government. We disliked this importation. We could have wished to have seen no more coolies landed; yet we interfered with no licences which had been issued before. But, surely, we were entitled to take the whole question of the "experiment" into consideration before it crystallised and became permanent.

The position of the labour market may, perhaps, have some bearing on this subject. In January, 1904, at the time of the Resolution to introduce Chinese labour, there were employed in the mines 12,814 whites and 75,027 coloured; no Chinese; and the output was £1,231,000. In November last there were 18,125 whites, 96,283 coloured — that was, 20,000 more—45,856 Chinese; while the output was £1,729,742. It has been put to me that if the white basis was not possible and the black basis was inadequate, why should there not be a black and a yellow basis? I do not accept the premises. I am not sure that a white basis is impossible; but I wish to say that our objection is not to the yellow, but rather to the conditions under which the yellow was introduced. As to the objection to the yellow itself, I think it very difficult to find anybody who does like it.

I have to apologise to the noble Viscount for finding myself unable to follow him in all the details upon which he argues in regard to the constitution to be adopted for the new colonies. I can assure him we most carefully considered the adaptation of what is called the Lyttelton Constitution. We spared no time or labour to adjust it if that was possible. We consider that it is our duty in framing what he has justly called the final form of constitution for these colonies to make it as perfect as is possible. For that time and inquiry are required. We have thought it desirable to remove the letters patent because that would avoid complications; but I wish it to be distinctly understood that this is entirely without prejudice to the consideration of the basis upon which that constitution was framed, to every particular of which we shall give our attention.

The noble Viscount asked whether I could not at least indicate the trend of our proposal. I think that is asking too much at the present time. We ask to have time to make inquiries; and I think the noble Viscount will admit that, if we give some information upon which we had not had time to form definite conclusions, and before we had examined every possible alternative, we might really be doing prejudice to the constitution as it finally comes before us. The noble Viscount asks whether we will undertake to announce—publish to this House, I suppose he means—the constitution when it is framed. That is a point on which I have not had an opportunity of getting any advice, and on which he will not, therefore, press me at this moment; but I believe there was no announcement made in the case of the Lyttelton Constitution, and I am not sure whether there is any precedent for such announcement in the case of the formation of responsible government.

The noble Viscount spoke on this matter with much earnestness; but I could have wished that it had been with rather less bitterness, if he will pardon my using that phrase. After all, the proposals of the late Government, although going by steps, did propose to achieve self-government, and all that they said when issuing the constitution which has now been annulled, was that they had not found it practicable to proceed to full self-government at that time. I am not convinced by the arguments used in that despatch. I am afraid I am not convinced by the arguments the noble Lord has brought before us this evening.

People sometimes speak of these colonies with which we have now to deal as if they had never had the opportunity of governing themselves before. The form of representative government is a natural form to be given to colonies which have come into existence in the way, so common throughout the world, of commercial settlements, which have gradually increased, and for which local government is therefore required. But that is not the case of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies. They have both governed themselves, and in the case of the Orange River Colony I should be prepared to say with no small measure of success.

The noble Viscount has spoken with great earnestness as to the danger of giving the Orange River Colony self-government. But I think we have also got to look to its past history and not take what I think is rather a prejudiced view of the position at the present time. There was this element in our situation. We found a practically unanimous demand in the Transvaal for the grant of responsible and not representative government. One expression used was that it was indeed a question of months, not of years. And although the Governor did not himself concur in that expression, he did himself propose that the number of seats which had been suggested in the representative government should be doubled in order that the change to responsible government should be thereby facilitated.

My Lords, I think a great deal of what the noble Viscount has said in regard to the dangers of introducing this form of government into the Orange River Colony turns on the comparative safety of the two institutions. On that point I should like, with the permission of your Lordships, to quote a few words from a more authoritative source than any of my own—

"It is difficult to understand how any English statesman could have imagined that representative and irresponsible government could be successfully combined. There seems, indeed, to be an idea that the character of representative institutions ought to be thus modified in colonies; that it is an incident of colonial dependence, that the officers of Government should be nominated by the Crown, without any reference to the wishes of the community, whose interests are entrusted to their keeping. It has never been clearly explained what are the Imperial interests which require the complete nullification of representative government. But if there be such a necessity, it is quite clear that a representative government in a colony must be a mockery and a source of confusion. For those who support this system have never yet been able to devise or to exhibit in the practical working of colonial government any means for making so complete an abrogation of political influence palatable to the representative body. . . . It was an unhappy consequence of this system that it relieved the popular leader of all the responsibilities of opposition. . . . The colonial demagogue bids high for popularity without the fear of future exposure. Hopelessly excluded from power, he expresses the wildest opinions, and appeals to the most mischievous passions of the people, without any apprehension of having his sincerity or prudence tested by being placed in a position to carry his views into effect."

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: Will the noble Lord state from whom he is quoting?

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I am quoting from Lord Durham's Report on Canada. The Government had no hesitation in choosing, as between responsible and representative government, in favour of responsible government. From the words I have quoted your Lordships will see that I have a personal interest in that decision which I need not be ashamed to avow in this House. Many years ago a similar question arose in another great colony, where the principles of responsible government were advocated and were put in force by my grandfather and my father. It is, I confess, an encouragement to me, in the views I have ventured to express to your Lordships, that I am following the principles they thus professed and which resulted in the prosperous, and great, and loyal Dominion of Canada.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, noble Lords on the Front Opposition Bench felt, during the speech of the noble Viscount who brought forward this question, that we should not be able to get very much information from the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies with regard to the intentions of His Majesty's Government and the basis of the new constitution which it is proposed to grant to the Transvaal. As far as we were able to ascertain from the speech of the noble

Earl, the reason why the Transvaal is to be granted the full rights of responsible government is that the inhabitants of that Colony desire it. That was the contention of the noble Earl. But I might point out that, naturally, the moment a Liberal Government comes into power, the whole population who are dissatisfied with the present *regime* immediately agitate as much as possible in order that they may get responsible institutions. All I can say is that when we were in office the Party in favour of representative government largely outweighed those who were in favour of responsible institutions.

But, in spite of the warnings which the noble Earl has received to-night from the noble Viscount who sits on the Cross Benches, we know that the Government are determined to grant responsible institutions to both the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. We must bow to that decision, but we do sincerely hope that the noble Earl will give us some Papers at a future date, and inform us on what basis the Transvaal Constitution is going to be granted. Is it to be granted more or less on the basis of the Lyttelton Constitution? That constitution was very carefully framed with regard to the views and the wishes of, we believe, the majority of the people of the Colony, and we believe that it met with their approval. I cannot help feeling that the noble Earl the Colonial Secretary is in the position very much of a great potentate who is about to grant a constitution to his subjects, but with this difference, that whereas the Czar of Russia cannot quite foretell the result of the constitutional measures he is going to grant to his subjects, the noble Earl is in the position of being able to say absolutely what kind of Ministry he desires to predominate in the legislative affairs of the Transvaal. The noble Earl, in dealing with this matter of Chinese labour in South Africa, was conciliatory enough to say that he felt sure that neither Party in the State would tolerate slavery in the British Empire. To that statement of the noble Earl we gladly subscribe. But I must say that when we heard that statement we did indeed regret that the noble Earl had reserved it for your Lordships' House, and had not made it on a public political platform during the first week of the General Election.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: We could not have done it then.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Then during the week previous to the General Election. My Lords, you will have observed the remarkable political play which the Liberal Party have placed upon the stage. Before the election they fought under the banner of slavery. ["No."]

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Certainly not.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I do not say noble Lords themselves so fought, but the Party to which they belong. Many were the statements and addresses in which the word "slavery" occurred. No words were bad enough for the Tory Party because they had allowed Chinese labour to be employed in South Africa. I have here cartoons, pamphlets, pictures, and violent statements, all put forward by members of the Liberal Party, some of whom are Ministers of the Crown to-day, pointing out what a vile practice this was, and it was nothing less than slavery. What happens then? Parliament assembles, and the Prime Minister, amidst the applause of his followers, proceeds to inform the House of Commons that it is not slavery; it is only "servile conditions." It is perfectly apparent that a certain section of the Liberal Party—Members who are somewhat enthusiastic upon this subject, and who moreover sincely and genuinely believe in their assertions that Chinese labour is slavery—would not subscribe to the statement of the Prime Minister. One of the most prominent of those Members of the House of Commons is, I think, the Member for the Abercromby division of Liverpool, and he told the Prime Minister on the first night that Chinese labour was wrong, and that it was impossible in the same breath to say that they would leave it to the responsible Government of the Colony to decide whether they would have Chinese labour or not. A day passes, and what is the next act in the play? The Government again speak upon this subject in the House of Commons. This time it is the

Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies who replies on behalf of the Government. This, indeed, I might term a day of abjuration for the Government. The electioneering arguments of the Party to which noble Lords opposite belong had to be thrown over, for the welfare of the Transvaal is at stake and havoc would otherwise ensue. The Under-Secretary of State, with, I think, perfect propriety and due regard for the welfare of the colony, said to the House of Commons "The electioneering extravagance of our Party must be repudiated; they were only" (I am not quoting his words)—"Chinese pills for Radical consumption; they may all be dismissed by the phrase 'terminological inexactitudes.'" We are told that the colony must decide this matter for itself; that they will have the right to decide whether or not they will have Chinese labour when responsible government is granted, and that until that time arrives the taint of slavery is to be entirely removed from the Ordinance by the fact that a few fines are remitted, and the Chinese are allowed to take free voyages at the expense of the British public—voyages, which, by the way, the noble Earl the Colonial Secretary must be pretty certain they are not likely to undertake, since this Blue-book shows that those who were forcibly repatriated immediately tried to get back to the Transvaal. Furthermore, the representative of the Colonial Office informed the House of Commons that the Colonial Secretary was in dead earnest in this matter, that from the first he had exerted himself, and that his gun was loaded, not with blank, but with ball cartridge. By the way, it is rather curious that neither the noble Marquess the Leader of the Party opposite nor the Colonial Secretary himself thought it necessary to fire that gun on the first day they met Parliament in your Lordships' House. Not a single reference was then made to the fact that these Chinese were going to be repatriated at the expense of the British public, and I think that, from that circumstance, we may assume that the members of the Cabinet did not attach very great importance to the decision.

But, my Lords, observe what happens then. The extreme members of the Radical Party in the other House decline to swallow this soothing syrup administered to them by the representative of the Colonial Office. In their opinion, Chinese labour is still slavery, and the Government cannot divest themselves of the responsibility by shifting it on to the colony itself. We see, therefore, what I may call the policy of the washing of hands, of free trips for the Chinese, and of the hope of the interference of the Empress of China. Then we realise that this policy, enunciated by the Government in the House of Commons, does not receive the desired mead of approval from the whole of their supporters, and what happens? Once again the Government speaks, this time through the President of the Board of Education. We notice at once that the Government have shifted their ground; they have evidently been subjected to severe cross-examination by the more extreme of their supporters. What does the President of the Board of Education say?—

> "Chinese labour is objectionable to the English people, and it could not and would not be approved of in time to come under any circumstances whatsoever."

But even this dose is not sufficiently strong, and another change comes over the scene. On Friday the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaks, and, in a somewhat saturnine pronouncement, tells the House of Commons that this employment of Chinese coolies in South Africa is slavery, and that the Government are going to resume their right of veto. As far as I understood the Colonial Secretary to-day, the noble Earl stated with perfect distinctness that if they thought it necessary or wise the Government would undoubtedly exercise the veto of the Crown in regard to any legislative Act passed by the new Transvaal Legislature.

My Lords, I ask this question: How is it that on Monday last the Government of His Majesty said that Chinese labour was not slavery; that on Wednesday what I have described as the policy of the washing of hands, of cheap trips for the Chinese, and of female interference was put forward as their definite and accepted policy, that on Thursday the policy was changed for something rather more stringent, and that finally on Friday the whole policy is reversed, and we are informed that slavery has been re-instated under the British flag and the Transvaal is to fall under the veto of the Crown? We on this side of the House, and, I venture to think, the people of the country—aye, and everybody in South Africa from Cape Town to the Zambesi—will wish to know why on Monday last, in the opinion of the Government, Chinese labour was not slavery and the Colony were to be left to decide this matter for themselves when responsible institutions were granted, while on the following Friday indentured labour is declared to be slavery and the Transvaal is not to be allowed to decide the matter for itself, but the veto of the Crown is to be invoked.

It was often our misfortune when we were in power to be criticised by noble Lords opposite for our policy as a Government. Searching comments were invariably made; our policy was declared not to be based on any principle, but to be a policy of expediency. I venture to think, however, that the annals of Parliament may be searched in vain to find a single parallel to the peripatetic utterances, contradictory statements, and versatile declamations which have marked the progress of His Majesty's Government during the first week of their official career in the two Houses of Parliament.

Now with regard to the position of the noble Lords opposite. We know that the noble Earl the President of the Council supports the policy of Monday last, or, of Wednesday—the policy of "not slavery, but servile conditions," the policy of the washing of hands, and of allowing the Colony to do as it likes. There are other members of the Cabinet with the same view, including, as far as I could gather, the Colonial Secretary himself. But we know that certainly one member of the Cabinet supports what I may call the policy of Friday. We know from his former utterances in this House the, I will not say extreme, but strong view which the Minister for Agriculture holds upon this matter. There is not the slightest doubt as to what he thought, and I must congratulate the noble Earl and those who support him on having been able to triumph in the Cabinet during the last few days, although I confess it seems remarkable that the Colonial Secretary should have been defeated on the very policy of his Department as announced by his subordinate in the House of Commons. The policy of conviction is evidently stronger than the policy of convenience. The noble Earl and those who think with him can go home with feelings of satisfaction that the principles they have upheld—I admit consistently upheld—have been adopted and endorsed by the whole Cabinet.

Now, my Lords, let us consider for one moment the position of His Majesty's Government as we understand it to-day. They are going to grant self-government to the Transvaal with one hand, while, with the other, they take it away by the reservation of the veto. And what for? You are going to knock the bottom out of the greatest principle which has been conceded to our colonies during the last fifty years—the right of self-government—in order to say that you have a right to control the native races in a new colony, and you are specially going to mark out the people of the Transvaal as incompetent to deal with this problem of alien labour. The noble Earl the Colonial Secretary referred to the fact that Australia and, I think, New Zealand, had protested against the importation of Chinese labour, but he forgot to add—perhaps he has not studied that particular despatch—that the Australians added "until responsible Government is granted." What they objected to was the Chinese going there under representative institutions or Crown colony government. I am sure they would not have said a word if the Transvaal had possessed responsible government. If the noble Earl grants the Transvaal responsible government and at the same time tries to dictate to the people of the colony the manner in which they should deal with the alien immigrants who come to the country, I venture to say that he will get a much stronger protest than the one he quoted, not only from Australia, but also from New Zealand and the other self-governing Colonies, telling him that his policy is reactionary, and that he is casting a slur upon the good citizenship of those who belong to the British Empire.

I presume that His Majesty's Government will be logical in this matter. Surely that is not too much to expect. If you intend to prohibit the indentured labour of Chinese coolies in the Transvaal, you ought in all logic and in all propriety to interfere in the management of all native races alike. What difference is there between the Chinese coolie and the Portuguese Kaffir? There is very little difference indeed. The system of indenture is very similar. The Portuguese Kaffir has to go back 150 miles. Has he any means of returning if he wishes to do so? I suggest that point for the consideration of noble Lords opposite. And what about the natives of Swaziland and Basutoland? Are you going to leave the administration affecting those races to the people in authority there? And what about the kanakas in Queensland? Are you going to assert the principle in the Transvaal of interfering with alien immigrants, and leave it alone in Australia? That seems to me to be an absolutely inconsistent position. By saying that you are going to interfere with the alien immigrants in the Transvaal you have committed yourselves to the principle of interfering with all these native races throughout our Colonies. The noble Earl will be asked to resume his right of control over the kanakas in Queensland, the aborigines of Western Australia, and the natives who go to the West Indies under the system of indentured labour, and I think that, when he contemplates the problem, he will feel the overwhelming nature of the work which is being cast upon him as Colonial Secretary. And what is it all for? It is all owing to the determined enthusiasm of noble Lords like the noble Earl opposite who insist upon pushing the Government as far as they possibly can.

In conclusion, I have only to point out how different is the position of His Majesty's Opposition in this matter of Chinese labour from the position of His Majesty's Ministers. We, indeed, were consistent all the way through; you have been thoroughly inconsistent, or, at any rate, your policy has been marked by great inconsistencies. We have always said that we placed implicit confidence in Pro-consuls like Lord Milner and Lord Selborne, and to-night we thoroughly endorse the words which have fallen from Lord Milner. We have always supported their views, and we have never found reason to differ from them. We have always said that Chinese labour is not slavery, and we adhere to that position. What we said and what we still say is that it was a necessary expedient to supplement the shortage of native labour. What has been its effect? Its effect has been well described by the noble Viscount who moved this Motion. It has maintained the position of the mining industry at the level which existed before the war; it has given employment to thousands of skilled white artisans who otherwise would not have got employment; and it has preserved the financial solvency of the Colony, which, after all, has to meet the interest on the Imperial debt which it has contracted. Moreover, we believe that this Chinese labour is, on the whole, in conformity with the wishes of the people of the Transvaal. As the noble Earl knows, 47,000 people in the Transvaal signed a petition in favour of it; the whole Legislative Council—which doubtless noble Lords opposite will despise to-day, but which has not changed its opinion in the least from the first day this problem was brought before it—voted in its favour, and I believe I am right in saying that all the Free Churches in South Africa are in favour of the maintenance of the policy of Chinese labour. The Majority Report of the Labour Commission, the Johannesburg Town Council, and many other bodies might be cited, but these are sufficient to prove our contention that we had with us—and this is the point upon which noble Lords opposite and we always quarrel—the support of the vast majority of the people of the Transvaal.

Then, my Lords, consider what has been the effect of the importation of the Chinese with regard to this country. We have been able to keep up a constant flow of gold into this country from South Africa during the last two or three years. One-third of the gold output of the world has come from South Africa to England. Noble Lords know perfectly well that increase of gold means increase of credit, and increase of credit means increase of trade, for gold is, after all, the ultimate reserve on which bankers base their credit. His Majesty's Ministers, speaking through the gracious Speech from the Throne, talk about the improvement in exports and imports, and it is mentioned as if it were due in some degree or entirely to the spirited speeches they have made on behalf of free trade. I venture to say that the satisfactory position of exports and imports is largely due to the fact that there has been a sufficient supply of gold, which has come from South Africa, and which could have been brought into this country only by the help of indentured Oriental labour.

These are only a few of the considerations I might bring forward as showing the grounds on which our policy was based. We well knew that it would lead to misrepresentation, though I admit that we never thought that that misrepresentation could possibly sink to the level of calumny that it has; but between our duty to our Colony and the possibility of being misrepresented in the constituencies during the General Election we did not hesitate for one single moment. It is true we have suffered; we have been badly defeated; we have suffered not because our policy was wrong, but because it was a policy which lent itself to misrepresentation; and I venture to say that when the people of Great Britain realise that His Majesty's Ministers have made themselves responsible certainly for the financial dislocation, and possibly for the financial ruin, of the Transvaal, that they have seriously impaired the prospects of trade in the United Kingdom, and that they have wantonly offered an affront to the people of the Transvaal, the Tory Party, although it is only one week since the session began, will be already on the high road to regain, and I hope to retain, the confidence and support of the British public of which they have been so vilely robbed.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I beg to move hat the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned till to-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 26th February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred to on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Cardiff Gas Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Great Eastern Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill; Merthyr Tydfil Gas Bill; Metropolitan District Railway Bill; Metropolitan Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill; Millwall Dock Bill; North Metropolitan Tramways Bill; North West London Railway Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; South Suburban Gas Bill; Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Watford Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.:—City of London Electric Lighting

Bill; Dowlais Gas Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Bacup Corporation Bill, read a second time, and committed.

Carlisle Corporation Bill; Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Kettering Water Bill, read a second time, and committed.

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, to be read a second time upon Monday next.

Metropolitan Water Board Bill, read a second time and committed.

New Mills Urban District Council Bill, Thornton Urban District Gas Bill, Todmorden Corporation Bill, read a second time, and committed.

Wigan and Heysham Railway Bill, ead a second time, and committed.

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee, not exceeding eleven members, to be called the Police and Sanitary Committee, to whom shall be committed all private Bills promoted by municipal and other ocal authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law

Ordered, That Standing Orders 150 and 173A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee shall report to the Committee of Selection that any Clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than Clauses containing police and sanitary regulations) are such, as having regard to the terms of reference it is not in their opinion necessary or advisable for them to deal with, the Committee of Selection shall thereupon refer the Bill to a Select Committee, who shall consider those Clauses and so much of the Preamble of the Bill as relates thereto, and shall determine the expenditure (if any) to be authorised in respect of the parts of the Bill referred to them. That the Committee shall deal with the remaining Clauses of such Bill, and so much of the Preamble as relates thereto, and shall determine the period and mode of repayment of any money authorised by the Select Committee to be borrowed and shall report the whole Bill to the House, stating in their report what parts of the Bill have been considered by each Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power, if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to the instructions which apply to, the undivided Committee, and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

PETITIONS.

ADMIRALTY (DISABLED SAILORS AND MARINES).

Petition from Carlisle, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Copy presented, of Fourteenth Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Inspection Committee for the year ended 20th

November, 1905, with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 57.]

NATIONAL DEBT (MILITARY SAVINGS BANKS).

Account presented, of the Gross Amount of all Moneys received and paid by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt on account of the Fund for Military Savings Banks, from 19th September, 1845, to the 5th January, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 58.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copies presented, of Treasury Minutes granting a retired allowance to each of the following, viz.:—

William Walter Kellaway, late Engineer (1st Class), Engineer in Chief's Department, Post Office.

Walter Robert Hoyles, Principal Foreman, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office.

Lewis Robert Ambrose, Claudius Robert Brock, Harry Clarke, Henry Eden, Henry Haley, James William Jater, William James Jater, William Samuel Priest, William Taylor, Overseers and Senior Telegraphists, Central Telegraph Office, Post Office [by Act]; to lie upon the Table

SUPERANNUATION ACTS, 1858 AND 1876.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th February, 1906, declaring Hanoi, Tonquin, French Indo-China, to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1905–6).

Copy presented, of Estimate of the Further Amount required during the year ending 31st March, 1906, beyond the sum already provided in the Grant for Navy Services for the year [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 59.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by G. A. Bonner, esquire, Barrister-at-Law, on the Draft Regulations proposed to be made for the processes of spinning and weaving Flax and Tow, and the processes incidental thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Southport, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANCY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy, Vol. I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Local Government Board under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, establishing two residentiary Canonries in the Cathedral Church of Newcastle in addition to the two established by Order in Council of 26th November, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the table.

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, exempting certain mixtures of Picric Acid from all restrictions under the Explosives Act, 1875, when kept and conveyed in manner specified [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th February, 1906, entitled "The Southern Nigerian Protectorate Order in Council, 1906," [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ROUMANIA (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF) (INTERIM STATEMENT).

Copy presented, of Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Roumania as modified by Commercial Treaties with the United Kingdom and Germany; together with a summary of the New Law relating to tare on goods dutiable by weight [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

Copy presented, of the Telegraphs (Inland Written Telegraph) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1906, dated 1st January, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).

Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 60.]

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Taxes on Food and Drink.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of Exchequer, whether he is aware that the amount of revenue received for taxes on food and drink, both Excise and Customs, during the last twenty years amounts approximately to £800,000,000; and whether he would consider the advisability of reducing the taxes on food by inaugurating a system of taxation, averaging 5 per cent., *ad valorem*, on imports, as introduced into India by a Liberal Government; if not, whether he would consider the question of a 5 per cent. tax on manufactured goods in place of the present taxes on cocoa and some other articles of general consumption.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am aware that the revenue from taxes on food and drink has amounted during the last twenty years to approximately the amount mentioned by the hon. Member. By far the greater part of that revenue has been derived from taxes on alcohol in various forms. The hon. Member will not expect me to deal with specific proposals for altering taxation in anticipation of the Budget statement.

Land Disturbances at Barhane—Case of John Padden.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether John Padden, who was denounced as a grabber at a meeting at Barhane, near Belmullet, county Mayo, on 3rd October, 1905, arising out of which Mr. John O'Dowd, M.P., and Mr. Conor O'Kelly, M.P., with Mr. James Mills, J.P., were indicted for alleged conspiracy, is still the occupier of the farm formerly rented by an evicted tenant, named Augustus Loftus; and whether John Padden has claimed and received, or is now receiving, police protection.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) John Padden is still in occupation of the farm in question. He has made no application for police protection, but the police are aware of the facts and are taking such steps as they think needed.

Rents on Colonel Smythe's Estate at Collinstown.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the amount of the rents charged to tenants of Colonel Smythe of Collinstown, Westmeath, which have only been paid in obedience to writs and out of moneys received from America and other extraneous sources; is he aware that the landlord wrote on the 23rd January last an offer, to remain open for a month, to sell at prices based upon those rents; that the proposed sale broke down owing to the landlord's refusal to consider the reinstatement of two evicted tenants whose former holdings are untenanted; and that on the 5th February, before the month for consideration had run half its course, Colonel Smythe had again served some of the tenants with writs for the hanging gale, there being no more due; and whether, seeing that such duress is extensively practised, and a danger to social peace and to the security of the State for the payment of annuities so contracted, His Majesty's Government propose to check or counteract in any way such conduct.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) No originating application or request as to the sale of this estate has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners, and they have no knowledge of the statements of fact alleged in the Question. I have no means of making a satisfactory inquiry as to the facts, and, even supposing them to be as stated, His Majesty's Government would have no power to interfere.

Improvement of Clifden Harbour County, Galway.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act a sum of money was allotted for the improvement of the Clifden harbour, county Galway, and that such improvement has not yet been carried out, although the last two Chief Secretaries repeatedly promised that no delay should occur in prosecuting the work; and whether he will state when the proposed work will commence.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) In March, 1903, the late Government announced to the Galway County Council its intention to allocate from funds provided under the Marine Works Act a sum of £4,000 on works at Kinvarra, Salt Hill, or Clifden, as might be arranged; but I am informed that no promise was made as to works at Clifden in particular. Of the amount mentioned, a sum of £1,100 was eventually allocated to Kinvarra. A difficulty arose in regard to Clifden by reason of the fact that the estimated necessary expenditure at that place amounts to some £9,000, that is to say, at least three times the amount available. I have now received a resolution of the Clifden Board of Guardians urging the necessity of the works, and I will take a convenient opportunity of looking into the matter. I may remind the hon. Member that, in adition to Kinvarra, a sum of over £8,500 has been allocated for works under the Marine Acts at Cleggan, Roundstone, and Kilronan, in county Galway.

River Shannon Fisheries Return.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he will grant the Return on to-day's Paper relating to the River Shannon Fisheries.

Appended is the Return referred to:—

Return of the amount of money received by the Shannon Navigation Commissioners and the Board of Works as rents or compensation for redundant waters supplied for mills or other purposes under the provisions of the Act 2nd and 3rd of Victoria, chapter 61; the amount of money received by the said Commissioners or the Board of Works in rents for mills, lands, fisheries, or other property, acquired under the said Act, from the year 1839 to the end of the year 1905; the quantity of property so acquired which has been leased or sold; the name of such places; the names of the lessees or purchasers of such places; the dates on which such leases were given and such purchases effected; the number of years for which such leases or purchases have been arranged in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I have already explained by letter to the hon. Member that I am unable to grant this Return.

Retirement of Mr. McConkey, Irish Board of Works.

MR. JOYCE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Robert McConkey, an official of the Irish Board of Works, who, after forty-six years service in various parts of Ireland, has been called upon to resign, without any charge, that he knows of, being brought against him, and who, after all those years of service, has been offered the sum of £41 as compensation; and whether he will inquire into this man's case, with a view to granting him a pension.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) This officer was retired in the ordinary course, on the ground of age and infirmity. The appointment which he held (overseer of the Shannon Navigation) did not entitle him to a pension on retirement, and he was treated in accordance with the usual practice, under which gratuities have been awarded to officers holding like appointments in the past.

Action of Dublin Police against Mr. Leech.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the recent proceedings before the police magistrate in Dublin in the case of Mr. Peter Leech, a member of the licensed trade; whether he is aware that the charge against Mr. Leech was made by a police sergeant named McElroy, whose sworn testimony the magistrate refused to believe, and whose action in the case he stated that he would report to the Commissioner of Police before he had heard the evidence for the accused or the statement of his legal representative; and will he say whether such a report has been received, and what action is the Government going to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) In this case the magistrate dismissed the complaint against Mr. Leech with a caution. In the course of the hearing the magistrate characterised the sergeant's evidence, relating to the production of a notebook, as contradictory and inaccurate, but did not say that he disbelieved the sergeant's evidence upon the main issue. The Chief Commissioner suitably admonished the sergeant for his carelessness, but was satisfied that he made no wilful misstatement.

Sub-Land Commissioner M Elligott.

MR. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the language used by Sub-Commissioner M'Elligott when valuing tenants' holdings in county Longford; and whether he will direct an inquiry into the fitness of this gentleman to give an impartial decision as between landlord and tenant in the fixing of fair rents in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Land Commission are not aware of any complaint as to language used by Mr. M'Elligot when valuing tenants' holdings. Any complaints on the subject should be brought to the knowledge of the Land Commission. As regards the question of impartiality, I may point out that the decisions of the Sub-Commission Court are subject to appeal.

Compulsory Sale of Irish Estates.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners contemplate taking any action in regard to those landlords in the West of Ireland and elsewhere who, under any condition or at any price, refuse to sell to their tenants under the Land Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have no knowledge, other than that which may be gained from the public Press, that there are any landlords in the West of Ireland or elsewhere, to whom the terms of the Question apply. If there be any such, the Commissioners have no power to interfere.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Cases of Margaret Fraser and Thomas Kent at Mitchelstown.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork, County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Estates Commissioners have yet considered the applications for reinstatement of Margaret Fraser and Thomas Kent, evicted tenants on the estate of the Countess of Kingston, Michelstown, as promised when this estate has been inspected.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estate Commissioners will consider the applications of these evicted tenants when the estate is being inspected, which will probably be about the end of next month.

Legal Advertisements in Dublin.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the officials of some of the Chancery Courts in Dublin require the solicitors to advertise legal notices in connection with cases pending in these courts in the *General Advertiser* newspaper, Dublin; and whether, in view of the circulation of that newspaper compared with that of the other Dublin newspapers, he will explain why that particular newspaper is selected, and will he announce that in future the other Dublin newspapers shall be capable of selection by the solicitor having carriage of the case.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) This is not a matter which in any way comes within my jurisdiction. The judges of the Chancery Division in Ireland have entire control of the advertising in their own courts, but I have made inquiries from their offices and I am informed that in the Lord Chancellor's Chambers and the Land Judge's Court the newspapers for advertisements are, as a rule, selected by the solicitors in the proceedings, and that advertisements are rarely published in the *General Advertiser.* The practice in the Chambers of the Master of the Rolls and Mr. Justice Barton is to require one advertisement in the *General Advertiser*, the reason for this rule being that it is considered desirable to have one newspaper in which parties may be sure of seeing all advertisements, and the *General Advertiser* is considered the most suitable for the purpose.

Promotion of Junior Supervisor in the Excise Outdoor Department.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that a junior supervisor in the Excise Outdoor Department has been appointed over the heads of 100 of his colleagues without any reasons being assigned for this proceeding; will he say what special qualification this gentleman had which his seniors did not possess, and have any reasons been since given for making this appointment; and will he abolish such a cover for favouritism.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The appointment referred to in the hon. Member's Question was one for which very special qualifications were required. The Board selected the senior officer who appeared to them to possess those qualifications in the requisite degree.

Alien Immigration Statistics for January.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough). To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether the delay in the issue of the list of alien immigrant arrivals from the Continent in January is due to any new form in which it is intended to publish the figures; and whether the Return will state the number of rejections, the reasons for such rejections, and the number of appeals to the Immigration Boards, and their results.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Act under which the information as to alien immigration from the Continent hitherto published was obtained has been repealed by the Aliens Act of last Session. Statistics are being compiled under the new Act with the view of giving in due course all the information possible with regard to the question of alien immigration in this country, but a stage has not yet been reached at which the periods for the publication of these statistics can usefully be settled.

Loan for Erection of a Dust Destructor at Acton.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether his attention has been called to the application by the Acton Urban District Council for sanction to a loan for the erection of a dust destructor on a site next to a new large public elementary school; and whether the Board will decline to give their sanction to a loan for such a purpose, other suitable sites being obtainable.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have had before me the application referred to. In all the circumstances of the case I do not propose to sanction the loan, and I have so informed the urban district council.

Postal Facilities at Collinstown, County Westmeath.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Postmaster-General, if he is aware that letters for Collinstown postal district, Westmeath, are brought in the morning from Streete Station to Castlepollard and kept there for nearly eight hours, with a loss of a business day to the persons addressed; that the post car could, at a merely nominal cost, go on to Collinstown and rest there instead of at Castlepollard; if he has seen a memorial presented to his predecessor last July praying this to be done; and if he will give that memorial favourable consideration now, or requires one more extensively signed.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A memorial on this subject was, as the hon. Member states, presented to my predecessor in July last, and the question was then fully examined. I find that the cost of the whole postal service in the district is already very high compared with the amount of correspondence, and I regret that I should not be justified in incurring further expenditure for the purpose of carrying out the improvement desired.

The Loishilman Railway.

MR. HART DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, what the length of the proposed Loishilman railway is to be; what is the intended terminus of the line, which apparently starts from near Jamrud; whether the line is for strategical or commercial purposes; on what gauge is it to be constructed; and what is the estimated total cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The length of the proposed railway is 22½ miles; its terminus is a point on the Kabul river, known as "mile 300"; it is undertaken both for strategic and for commercial purposes; its gauge is 5 feet 6 inches; and the estimated total cost is 50 lakhs of rupees.

Nationalist and Orange Disturbance at Glasslough, County Monaghan.

MR. O'HARA (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any report has been received from the county Monaghan police authorities as to a disturbance which took place at Glasslough, county Monaghan; whether he is aware that a police sergeant named Bennett intercepted a Nationalist band and, on their declining to obey his command, an attack was made upon them by an Orange mob headed by two local postmen named Hearst; will he say by what right Bennett prevented the Nationalist band marching along the public road; and whether any official cognizance will be taken of the action of the Messrs. Hearst, who are engaged in the postal service.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*): I am informed that this incident is the subject of proceedings pending at petty sessions against the police sergeant and others, and, following the invariable practice, I must decline to make any statement in the matter while those proceedings are *sub judice*.

Mortuary for Rathmines and Rathgar Districts.

MR. CLANCY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that no morgue has been provided for the urban district of Rathmines and Rathgar, with the result that inquests in that district must frequently be held in public houses, while the dead bodies are kept in stables and outhouses; and whether he will, through the Local Government Board, urge on the District Council of Rathmines to provide such necessaries as a morgue before proceeding with any further schemes for extending the boundaries of their district.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The circumstances mentioned do not appear to have been brought to the notice of the Local Government Board; but the Board have ascertained that the Rathmines Urban District Council have decided to include in next year's estimate the necessary provision for the erection of a morgue.

Trials of Chinese Labourers.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in what respects the trial of Chinese labourers will in future differ from the past, in view of the fact that they will still be tried by the same official, and that the proceedings will still be conducted in the Chinese language; and whether an English interpreter will be present at all trials.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) It is proposed to retain the present system of trial, which gives to the Chinese prisoner the advantage of being tried by a magistrate who understands his language, of being able himself to follow the proceedings, and of being independent of an interpreter. The proceedings will be public, and the presence of an English interpreter will, no doubt, be secured when required.

Norwich Cavalry Barracks.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed at an early date to proceed with the new cavalry barracks at Norwich; and, if so, whether the barracks will be built upon the plans submitted by the Director of Barrack Construction and approval by the Army Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I fully appreciate the patriotic offer of the citizens of Norwich, and am anxious to meet their wishes to retain a cavalry regiment, if this can be done without prejudicing the organisation of the Army in future. Barrack policy must be subservient to and dependent on general policy, which I am now carefully considering, and I cannot assent to the expenditure of nearly £200,000 on new barracks at Norwich until I am in a position to arrive at a decision on the question of military policy involved.

Payment of Election Expenses—Salaries to Members of Parliament.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a measure to enable the payment of election expenses and a fair salary for attendance to Members of this House, payable from the Treasury; and whether he can state what is the existing practice and what are the payments in the British Colonies.

(*Answered by Sir Henry-Campbell Bannerman.*) The matter is under the consideration of His Majesty's Government. The existing practice as to such payments in British Colonies is as follows:—Canada—(*a*) A session of more than thirty days. $2,500 for the session; (*b*) A session of thirty days or less. $20 for each day's attendance. 4–5 Edw. 7, c. 43, s. 2. Australia—£400 a year. (Imperial Act.) 63 and 64 Vic., c. 12, s. 48. New Zealand—£300 per annum. 4 Edw. 7, c. 24, s. 2. Tasmania—£100 per annum. 54 Vic., c. 20. West Australia—£200 per annum. 64 Vic., c. 32, s. 2. South Australia—£200 per annum. Acts No. 399 of 1887 and No. 476 of 1890. Queensland—£300 per annum. 60 Vic. c. 5, s. 4 (1). New South Wales—£300 per annum. 2 Edw. 7, c. 32, s. 28. Victoria—£300 per annum. Act No. 1,075 of 1890, s. 126. Cape of Good Hope—(*a*) Members resident within fifteen miles from House of Parliament: One guinea for each day of attendance; (*b*) More than fifteen miles: One guinea remuneration, and 15s. allowance for personal expenses for every day of absence from home on his Parliamentary duties. Act No. 16 of 1888, ss. 2, 4–5. Natal—£1 daily travelling allowance in the cases of Members who reside three miles or more from the place of assembly. Act No. 2 of 1888, s. 1. See also 19 of 1887 and 14 of 1893, s. 41. Newfoundland—The payments are voted annually. In The Public Service Act, 1905 (c. 23, p. 31) provision is made for $8,300, the salaries of thirty-six members. The *Journal of the Assembly* for 1902 gives the rates as $300 and $200. The $8,300 is probably made up as follows: eleven Members resident in our parts, at $300, $3,300; twenty-five Members resident in St. John's, at $200, $5,000.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Port Defences.

Mr. RIDSDALE (Brighton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the mine defences, formerly in charge of the War Department, for the defence of our mercantile ports, such as Liverpool, Hull, and other places, have been removed; and, if so, what system it is intended to adopt for the protection of these ports in their stead.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The Answer to the first part of my hon. friend's Question is in the affirmative. As regards the latter part it is not desirable to make any statement.

Congo Free State.

SIR WILLIAM EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs if action is being taken by the British Government to check the slavery and atrocities alleged to be taking place in the Congo Free State and other African territories.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I can only repeat the Answer given last Wednesday; that Papers will shortly be laid with reference to the Congo State. Inquiry is being made as to when the Commission at Brussels is likely to report as to the best means of carrying out the reform recommended in Congo Administration.

China and the Tibetan Treaty.

SIR HENRY COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can inform the House of the present condition of the negotiations between the Government of India and the Government of China regarding the confirmation or modification of the agreement concluded in August, 1904, at Lhasa with the Tibetan authorities; and whether he is in a position to lay Papers on the subject before the House.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As was stated on Thursday last, negotiations are proceeding between His Majesty's Government and the Chinese Government in regard to the terms of a Convention for the adhesion of China to the Convention concluded with Tibet in 1904. No statement can be made and Papers cannot be presented during the progress of the negotiations.

Old Age Pensions.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state approximately what annual sum would be required to provide a pension of 5s. per week for every person in the United Kingdom over the age of sixty-five years.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The number of persons above sixty-five years of age enumerated in the 1901 Census was 2,018,716. To provide them with a pension of 5s. a week would, therefore, require over £26,225,000.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman circulate for the information of Members what has been done in regard to this Question in the Australian Colonies and New Zealand?

MR. ASQUITH: I will consider that.

Alcohol for Industrial Purposes.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will introduce at an early date a Bill containing those clauses of the Revenue Bill of last session which were proposed in order to give effect to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on the use of alcohol for industrial purposes.

MR. ASQUITH: The matter is under consideration, and I will make a statement at a later date.

Grants to Universities.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has undertaken to include in the Estimates for 1906–7 a sum of £20,000 for the building fund of the University College of North Wales, to which fund £61,000 have been subscribed locally; if so, whether any conditions have been attached to the proposed grant; and whether he will make provision in the Estimates for similar grants to the Universities and University Colleges of England in the same proportion to the local subscriptions.

MR. ASQUITH: I have undertaken to ask Parliament to make a grant of £20,000 to the building fund of the College when the money is actually required for the scheme and subject to the condition that a similar sum has first been spent upon it from other sources. No part of this grant will have to be provided in the Estimates for 1906–7. Similar grants have already been made to the two other Welsh Colleges of like character. No such grants have in the past been made to University Colleges in England,

and, as the annual grants to these institutions were largely increased—as I think most properly increased—by the right hon. Gentleman when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, I am not, as at present advised, prepared to recommend a change of policy.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not in the least complain of the grant the right hon. Gentleman makes to Wales, but I shall call attention to the subject on the Estimates in order to secure an equivalent grant for English colleges.

Exchequer Bonds.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that the Exchequer bonds to be paid off on 18th April next were drawn on 6th February, but that notice of the numbers of the bonds so drawn was not published for about a week thereafter, and in face of the obvious inconvenience of this course, he can see his way to arrange that the numbers when drawn shall be at once published.

MR. ASQUITH: In accordance with the Regulations published in the London Gazette of the 18th August last, the bonds were drawn in the presence of the Comptroller-General of the National Debt the Deputy-Governor of the Bank, and a representative of the Treasury. The list was sent to these gentlemen to be certified before being published in the Gazette. I agree that the drawn numbers should be published without any delay, and I will take steps to have this done in future, issuing a special Gazette if necessary for the purpose.

Joint Stock Banks and Bank of England Notes.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether he is aware that joint stock banks in Great Britain are entitled to refuse to negotiate notes of the Bank of England; and whether, in view of frequent inconvenience to the public, he proposes to introduce legislation to deal with it.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I am aware that the joint stock banks are not under legal obligation to cash notes of the Bank of England, and I do not think it would be possible to impose such an obligation upon them. A Bank of England note is legal tender, but it would be impossible to require a joint stock bank to keep a cash reserve to change all the Bank of England notes that might be presented to it.

Political Refugees—Aliens Act.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): On behalf of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. RAMSEY MACDONALD) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Alexander Ouix, a Russian non-commissioned officer and social democrat, who was refused permission under The Aliens Act, 1905, to land at Harwich on the 12th instant, because he was not considered to have proved that he sought admission to this country solely to avoid prosecution on political grounds, although two companions gave evidence to his escape from Russia for these reasons; and whether, in view of this and similar cases, he will consider the amendment of the Act so that the right of political asylum may be maintained.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have caused special inquiry to be made into all the circumstances of this case. I am informed that the immigrant had only one companion, that they came by ship from Denmark, and that no statement to the effect suggested in the question was made to the immigration officer or the interpreter. In the written statements of particulars signed by the immigrants the occupation of both was given as "workers," and the last permanent place of abode of the immigrant whose name was given as Ouix was stated to be Copenhagen. Ouix did not appeal to the Board, but returned at once to Denmark. I am confident that the immigration officials are doing their utmost to administer the Act in accordance with the intentions of Parliament as regards political refugees.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Was this immigrant aware that he had a right of appeal?

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: That fact appears on the papers.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: And is it not laid down in the regulations that both the immigrants and the masters of ships shall be informed that they have a right of appeal?

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: Yes.

MR. CROOKS: In what language?

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: In the British language.

MR. CROOKS: Oh! that accounts for it.

Pentonville Prison—Governor's Salary.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department under what circumstances was Major O. Davies, a half-pay Army officer, appointed the new Governor of Model Prison, Pentonville; what amount does he receive from the Army, and what is his salary as governor of this prison; and whether he will consider the desirability of appointing civilians to such posts.

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: Major Davies was appointed Governor of Pentonville Prison in the ordinary course of promotion, having been appointed to the Prison service in 1894, and having served with credit as Deputy Governor of Pentonville and Governor of four smaller prisons successively. He is on the retired list and draws an Army pension of £200, and his salary as Governor, which is reduced on account of his Army pension, is £624 16s. It is the practice already to "consider the desirability" of appointing civilians to the Prison service, and at present there are forty-one civilians in charge of prisons, and only twenty-nine naval or military officers.

Laundry Workers.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories in which it is stated that 144,038 women and girls are working in laundries not regulated by the Factory Acts; and whether he proposes to take any steps to remedy their condition.

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: I have had before me the Report to which the hon. Member refers. I must point out, however, that it is not quite correct to say that 144,038 women and girls are working in "unregulated laundries." The heading in the census returns from which the figure in the question is obtained is "laundry and washing service" and out of the 122,463 women in England and Wales alone who are engaged in this service but are not under the Factory Act over 73,000 are returned as "working at home." The question of legislation for unregulated laundries, *i.e.*, laundries where not more than two persons from outside are employed, will have my careful consideration.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give a Return showing the number of persons engaged in regulated and unregulated laundries.

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE asked for notice.

Lambeth Hairdressers and Early Closing.

MR. S. COLLINGS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has yet issued the Early Closing Order applied for by the Lambeth Borough Council applying to the hairdressers' trade in the borough of Lambeth; if not, will he state when it is his intention to do so.

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: I have been in communication with the Borough Council in this matter and have communicated to the Town Clerk my provisional approval of a draft Order applying to the hairdressers' trade; but the Order as finally made has not yet been submitted to me for confirmation.

The New Russian Tariff.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a new Russian tariff about to be enforced increasing still further the duties against British goods, now averaging some 131 per cent. *ad valorem*; and if His Majesty's Government proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Representations as to the probable effect of the new Russian tariff on British export trade have been addressed to the Russian Government.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Is it not the case that the new Russian tariff will fall not merely on British goods but on the goods of all foreign countries?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I believe that is so.

The Flax Industry.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the number of persons employed in the flax industry in the United Kingdom for the year 1900 and subsequent years.

The hon. Member had also the following Questions on the Paper:—

To ask the President of the Board of Trade what has been the decrease per cent. in the number of flax-spinning factories and the number of spindles in the United Kingdom since the year 1870; what has been the increase per cent. of the importation of flax yarns into the United Kingdom from abroad during the same period; and what has been the loss of employment to British and Irish workpeople involved in these changes.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in England the flax spinning industry has become nearly extinct, that in Scotland it has been reduced more than one-half during the past thirty years, and that in Ireland 200,000 spindles have been stopped since 1870; whether he has any official information showing that this decline is due to the high tariffs on British goods imposed by foreign countries; and whether he proposes to take any steps to arrest the further decay of this industry?

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in the United States the duty on plain linens imported is 35 per cent., while on manufactured and finished handkerchiefs the duty is 60 per cent., and if embroidered, 70 to 80 per cent.; whether he is aware that the effect of this discrimination has been to transfer works for hemstitching and finishing handkerchiefs from the North of Ireland to the United States; whether he is able to state the extent to which Irish labour has been displaced through the operation of these duties; and whether he has any remedy to suggest for this loss of an industry?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In 1901 there were 96,788 persons employed in flax factories in the United Kingdom. No figures are available for later years or for 1900. Since 1870 the number of flax spinning factories has fallen from 283 to 127 and the total spindles from 1,549,547 to 1,075,855. A Report issued by the Board of Trade in 1898 (Cd. 8794) indicates that Yorkshire was formerly an important seat of the flax industry, which has now been displaced largely owing to the growing demand for labour in better paid industries, such as woollen, worsted, and mining. In Scotland the number of spindles in the flax trade has declined by nearly one half since 1870, its place being taken by jute. The number of flax and jute spindles in Scotland has increased by 5 per cent. since 1870. In Ireland the decline of spindles in the flax trade since 1870 was only one quarter of that stated in the Question. Concurrently with the decline in flax spinning there has been an increase in the better paid trade of linen weaving, the number of power looms in the United Kingdom having increased since 1870 from 35,301 to 54,440. The change from spinning to weaving has been accompanied by a great increase in the imports of flax yarns (mainly coarse) which have risen in value from £54,000 in 1870 to £769,000 in 1905. The value of our exports, however (which consist of the finer yarns) amounted to £928,070 in 1905, and their level has been practically maintained for the last twenty years. There seems no reason to believe that the operation of foreign tariffs on yarns has been the principal cause of the changes which have taken place in this industry. The United States duties on linen manufactures are not correctly stated in the Question, but it is a fact that the difference between the American duties on plain linens and on finished and embroidered handkerchiefs has operated adversely to our export of the latter articles. Our total exports of linen manufactures have, however, been fully maintained during the past twenty years. No estimate of the effect on British and Irish labour of the importation of flax yarns or the operation of the American tariff on particular classes of manufactures would be of any value which did not take into account the broad changes which have taken place both in the industry as a whole and also in kindred trades.

*Mr. LONSDALE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the cultivation of flax in the north of Ireland has decreased by 75 per cent. in about thirty years?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE. I believe that is the case.

*Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: Is it not the fact that no Protectionist countries have succeeded in gaining any reduction in the American linen duties?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is so, I believe.

Foreign Ships in British Ports—Life Saving Regulations.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if Foreign ships in British ports are exempt from any of the regulations in force as regards British ships for the safety of life; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government proposes to take any steps to deprive Foreign vessels of this preference in British waters.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The question to which the hon. and gallant Member refers was dealt with by a Select Committee last Session; and a Bill is being prepared to carry into effect, among other matters, the recommendation of that Committee.

Coupling Accidents to Railway Servants.

Mr. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of fatal and non-fatal accidents, respectively, which occurred to railwaymen engaged in coupling or uncoupling operations during the year 1905.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: So far as can be stated at present, there were, during 1905, twelve fatal and 523 non-fatal accidents to railway servants while engaged in coupling or uncoupling operations. These figures may be subject to some slight alterations before the Returns are published, but are substantially correct.

*Mr. H. J. TENNANT: Are any experiments being made with regard to automatic couplings and what progress has been made?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes; the matter is being gone into at the present moment.

Use of Shunting Poles on Railways.

Mr. BELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of fatal and non-fatal accidents, respectively, which occurred to railwaymen due to using or carrying about shunting poles not actually engaged in coupling or uncoupling operations during the year 1905.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: In addition to ten cases of accident to railway servants through the improper use of coupling poles as brakesticks, there appear to have been during the year 1905, twenty-one accidents, fortunately none of them fatal, due to the fact that a coupling pole was being used or carried, apart from accidents occurring in the actual operation of coupling or uncoupling.

Foreigners and Pilotage Certificates.

*MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the number of foreign subjects who hold pilotage certificates enabling them to pilot their vessels in or out of British ports, and the nationality of the holders of such certificates; and whether foreigners to whom such certificates are granted are subjected to the condition imposed upon British subjects in the London pilotage district, viz., that they shall furnish proof that they are well affected towards His Majesty the King and His Government.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: On the 31st March last, certificates enabling their holders to pilot in British compulsory pilotage waters the vessels of which they were masters or mates, were held by eighty-five foreign subjects, viz., two Belgians, three Danes, forty-one Dutchmen, thirteen Frenchmen, ten Germans, three Russians and thirteen Swedes. Of these eighty-five certificates, seventy-one had been issued by the Trinity House, who are the pilotage authority for the London district, and I am informed by them that the condition referred to by the hon. Member is not imposed upon either British or foreign candidates for such certificates. Of the other fourteen cases I have no definite information. I am informed that the condition referred to is in accordance with long-standing custom, imposed by the Trinity House upon all candidates for pilot's licences, which are quite distinct from the pilotage certificates granted to masters and mates.

Fees under the Trade Marks Act.

*MR. G. CROYDON MARKS (Cornwall, Launceston): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the fees prescribed in the new rules made by the Board of Trade for regulating the practice under the Trade Marks Act, 1905, which comes into operation on the 1st April, are greatly in excess of those charged under the old Act; whether he is aware that under such new rules for a fee of 5s. the Registrar of the Trade Marks Branch of the Patent Office is required to make an examination or search of the existing registered trade marks and arrive at a decision as to accepting or rejecting an application to register a new trade mark; yet, if he is asked to state how and why he thus arrived at such a decision, the fee payable is £2, or eight times the amount charged for doing the work involved for enabling the decision to be arrived at; and whether any revision of such scale of fees will be made prior to the 1st April.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The rules to which the hon. Member refers are draft rules, and are subject to alteration. The Board of Trade are in communication with the Chamber of Commerce, the Chartered Institute of Patent Agents, and other bodies with a view of obtaining the fullest information as to the opinions of those interested in the proposed rules, and they have arranged that a conference, to which the principal Chambers of Commerce, the Chartered Institute, and other bodies have been invited to send representatives, should shortly take place at the Board of Trade to discuss the rules and schedules of fees before they are finally issued. I must, however, remind the hon. Member that the question of the fees to be charged does not rest wholly with the Board of Trade, as the sanction of the Treasury is required by the Act.

The Telephone Company's Employees—Conditions of Transfer to Government Service.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state when the Bill is to be introduced which was promised by his predecessor in the last Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Telephone Transfer Committee anent the conditions under which the employees of the present Telephone Company are to be transferred to the service of the Post Office?

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): As the staff of the National Telephone Company will not be taken over by the Post Office until the 1st January, 1912, it is not intended to introduce the necessary Bill at present or until the conditions of the transfer of the Company's system, which will require statutory authority, can be more exactly foreseen than at present.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is it intended to introduce any Bill embodying these conditions?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I take it it will be necessary to bring in a Bill before 1912 on which this question can be raised.

Drumlish Postal Arrangements.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the advisability of directing that the present mid-day delivery of letters from Longford to Leitrim Crossroads be continued to Drumlish, only two miles further on, by bicycle if necessary.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: A report on the subject has been called for, and on its receipt I shall be glad to consider the question of affording the improvement in the service to Drumlish desired by the hon. Member.

The Bradford Report.

SIR WILLIAM EVANS-GORDON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he proposes to carry out forthwith the recommendations of the Bradford Commission.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No, Sir. The present Government have no responsibility nor obligation in regard to the Bradford Committee.

The Select Committee on Post Office Wages.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he proposes to include rural sub-postmasters (unestablished) and rural postmen in the inquiry to be held into the pay and conditions of service of postal employees.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes, Sir.

Redistribution.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Report of the Redistribution Committee appointed by his predecessor last summer is of a confidential nature; and, if not, can he say whether the Committee reported in favour of forming the municipal borough of Merthyr Tydvil into a separate and single member constituency; and will the expenses incurred by the Committee come out of the public purse, and be included in the Supplementary Estimates.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The Committee were appointed to obtain information for the guidance of the late Government in framing a Scheme for the Redistribution of seats at Parliamentary Elections. The Report was confidential, and I am unable to give any information as to its contents. The expenses of the Committee have been defrayed out of the Vote for Temporary Commissions, and will be included in a Supplementary Estimate in respect of that Vote.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Then what does the British taxpayer get for his money?

MR. JOHN BURNS: That may transpire on the Supplementary Estimates.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin, County N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the expediency of calling on those who ordered the inquiry and got the confidential Report to pay the cost?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I think under the circumstances it was reasonable and discreet that the document should be made confidential. Under similar circumstances I should ask that it be so regarded. It was in the public interest.

MR. CLANCY: How do we know that?

London University and the School of the Mines.

SIR WILLIAM COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what action he proposes to take on the Report of the

Departmental Committee on the Royal College of Science and the School of Mines; and whether any re-organisation of the University of London is contemplated, with a view to the association with it of the Royal College of Science and the School of Mines.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Report of the Departmental Committee is receiving the careful consideration of the Board; they are awaiting a communication from the Senate of London University on the subject. I am afraid I cannot make any more definite statement for the present.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): Can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that the Senate of the University of London will have ample opportunity of expressing their views before a definite decision is arrived at?

MR. BIRRELL: I am awaiting a communication from the Senate of that body, and it shall have all the attention it deserves.

The Proposed Hammersmith Exhibition.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Eye Division of Suffolk, as Church Estates Commissioner, whether his attention has been drawn to the circumstances attaching to a long lease of eighty-four acres of land recently granted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners at Shepherd's Bush for the purpose of an exhibition, and to the absence from the lease of any covenant prohibiting the lessee from applying for a licence to sell beer, wine, or spirits thereon; whether he is aware that licences have been applied for to sell such liquors on forty-four places on the land; and whether he is in a position to give on behalf of the Commissioners, any explanation as to the omission from the lease of any such condition, and an assurance that in future all leases granted by them shall contain either a restrictive or prohibitive covenant in connection with such applications.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): May I be allowed to answer this Question? The facts relating to this letting were given to the hon. Member in answer to his Question on the same matter in May last in the following terms: "The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have agreed to let an area of about eighty-four acres of land at Hammersmith for a long term of years for the purpose of an exhibition similar to that at Earl's Court or at the Crystal Palace. As regards the lands used for exhibition purposes, the Commissioners do not think it practicable to prohibit any application by the lessee for licences for the sale thereon of wine, beer, and spirits in connection with the supply of refreshments. The recent application to the licensing justices to which the Question refers was made by the intending lessee, and the Commissioners had no knowledge that any application was about to be made or as to the number of places in which it would be asked that liquors might be sold." In addition, I am now able to say that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have received notice that a fresh application will be made by the lessee to the licensing magistrates in the present month, and it is the Commissioners' intention to be then represented. The Commissioners are informed that the application will be for a licence in respect of eleven places only within the Exhibition and grounds. With regard to the last part of the Question, it is the policy of the Commissioners to limit the number of licences on their building estates in accordance with the real needs of the neighbourhoods, but within that limit they deal with any application of their lessees for permission to acquire a licence as they deem most reasonable having regard to all the circumstances.

Illegal Trawling in the Firth of Forth.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to complaints made to the Fishery Board for Scotland of the recent presence of certain trawling vessels within the prohibited area of the Firth of Forth off the Anstruther and Cellardyke coasts; and if he can give an assurance that preventive measures will promptly be taken against any infraction of the bye-laws of the Fishery Board.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Instructions have been given that every effort should be made to put a stop to the illegal trawling complained of by the hon. Member.

Local Taxation in Scotland.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if the Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Local Government Board to make inquiry into the incidence of local taxation in Harris, North and South Uist, and Barra, has been received; if it is to be published, and what the Government proposes to do to relieve those parishes of the excessive taxation they bear.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Report referred to by the hon. Member is at present under consideration, and it has been thought expedient to extend the inquiry to the Lews, where the financial conditions are analagous. Until that inquiry is concluded the question of publication, as well as of the necessity for Government relief, cannot be decided.

Edinburgh School Board, and the Training of Teachers.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been directed to a resolution adopted by the Edinburgh School Board disapproving of the Draft Resolutions recently issued by the Scottish Education Department for the training of teachers in Scotland in respect that the said Draft Resolutions propose to create a new method of training under non-representative authorities without full security that candidates will receive adequate practical training, and that the children of parents in humble circumstances will have obstacles placed in their way to the teaching profession; whether he can state when the Draft Resolutions are likely to be considered by the Department; and whether an opportunity will be given to the House, and in particular to the Scottish Members, for a full discussion of the subject before the Draft is definitely put into a Minute and laid upon the Table.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am aware of the resolution adopted by the Edinburgh School Board. I am also aware that equally important educational authorities such as the School Boards of Glasgow and Govan have approved of the Draft Regulations. The Draft Regulations will be further considered by the Department when the reports of the Provincial Committees have been received. But representations received from other educational bodies will also be considered, and in order that full opportunity may be given to School Boards and others to make themselves acquainted with the scope of the proposals, the Draft Regulations have been put on sale. No announcement as to subsequent action can be made till the Regulations have been considered by the Department in the light of the reports of the Provincial Committees and of other representations received.

Scottish Fishery Board.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the fact that on the Fishery Board for Scotland, recently re-appointed by him, only one representative out of seven belongs to the West of Scotland; whether he is aware that the fish trade of Glasgow and the fishermen of the West of Scotland are unanimous that they should have further representation on the Board; and whether, under such circumstances, he is prepared to increase the number on the Board so as to give Glasgow and the West of Scotland further representation there.

MR. SINCLAIR: Strictly speaking, the representative element upon the Fishery Board consists of four members; excluding the Chairman, the legal member, and the scientific member, in regard to whose appointment local representative qualifications cannot be the governing consideration. It is the case that of those four members, only one belongs to the West of Scotland, and he belongs to the Clyde. Representations did reach me not only in favour of more than one candidate for membership of the Fishery Board as qualified to represent the Clyde, but also in favour of candidates qualified to represent other districts of Scotland, and I greatly regret that it was not possible for me in re-appointing the Fishery Board to meet their views. The number of members forming the Board is fixed by statute, and can only be altered by legislation. The wide distribution of the fishing population in Scotland makes it impossible that all the fishery districts shall be directly represented upon the Board.

Granard Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of the Granard, County Longford, estate, which has been sold under the Ashbourne Act to the tenants, four tenants have been deprived of turbary, to which on the face of their vesting orders they were entitled; and whether he will call the attention of the Estates Commissioners to these cases with a view to securing proper treatment for them.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Granard estates were sold under the Land Purchase Acts of 1885 and 1891, not under the Act of 1903. Some of the tenants were given by their vesting orders a right to cut turf for consumption, but not for sale, on parts of certain bogs in the possession of the vendor In other cases, certain bogs were conveyed to trustees by trust deeds, to which the Land Commission were not parties, for the purpose of providing turbary for the tenant purchasers therein named, and these deeds conferred on the trustees very ample powers for making rules and regulations as to these turbary rights. I am not aware that any of the tenant purchasers have been deprived of any turbary rights to which they were entitled either under their vesting orders or these turbary deeds. In reply to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's question, I beg to say that I have called the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the matter, and I am informed by them that they have no power to intervene in the matter as suggested. Any tenant purchaser who is deprived of his rights can obtain redress by action either against the owner of the bog or the trustees under the turbary deeds.

Flax Cultivation in Ireland.

*MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that during the five years 1900–4 the average acreage under flax in Ireland was only 48,000, and the estimated produce was returned at 10,533 tons, whereas in 1880–4 the average acreage was 121,000 and the estimated produce 21,688 tons; and what measures are being adopted by the Department of Agriculture to encourage the cultivation of flax, particularly in Ulster, where the conditions are the most suitable for the growth of this crop.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The figures are as stated, but it should be observed that they indicate an increased production per acre. In the period 1880–4 the average yield of flax per acre was 28¾ stones, while in the later period it was 34¾ stones. Since 1901 the Department, with the assistance of an Ulster Advisory Committee, have adopted a scheme for encouraging improved cultivation of flax. The means taken to achieve this end include experiments in the manuring and manipulation of flax, and with different varieties of seed; the offering of prizes for well scutched flax and for growing flax; assistance in the formation of co-operative flax growing and scutching societies; the dissemination of information as to the quality of Dutch and Russian flax seed available each year for sowing; instruction in improved methods of dealing with the crop; measures for bringing the Irish flax grower into direct contact with the methods of their competitors in Belgium; improvement of marketing facilities; and other measures.

*MR. LONSDALE asked if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the expediency of offering a small bonus to cultivators in the North of Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: That Question raises large issues. Of course any suggestion made with a view of encouraging the cultivator will have careful consideration.

Irish School Grants.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the reduction in the amount of the school grants paid to teachers under the intermediate education system, Ireland, for the year 1905; is he aware that the grants paid for each pass in junior grade fell from £8 3s. 6d. per pupil to £5 14s., in middle grade from £16 7s. to £11 8s., and in senior from £24 10s. 6d. to £17 2s., and showed proportionate reductions in each grade for passes with honour; and whether, in view of the promised increase in the Exchequer grants in aid of secondary education in England, steps will be taken for securing the interests of teachers connected with secondary education in Ireland.

Mr. BRYCE: The facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. The reduction in the amount of the grants was due mainly to the increase in the numbers of students in the pass and honours lists, and in a less degree to a decrease in the amount received by the Intermediate Education Board from the Local Taxation Account. The matter referred to in the last part of the Question will not escape my attention, and I may add that the entire system upon which grants for Intermediate Education are made in Ireland appears to me to require serious consideration.

Irish Fisheries

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) has been again called to the damage done to the mackerel fisheries of the south and south-west coasts of Ireland by fleets of boats engaged in fishing for herrings during such season as involves the capture of quantities of immature mackerel; and, in view of the inquiry of 1892, and the report of the fishery inspectors in 1893, which recommended, for the protection of the mackerel fishery, that a close season for herrings should be established from Poer Head to Mizen Head from 1st April to 16th May in each year, will the Department take steps to preserve a great Irish industry from extinction.

Mr. BRYCE: The Department held an inquiry into this matter at Kinsale in October last, and, as a result, a bye-law intended to be of an experimental character was prepared, providing a close time for the taking of herrings in the district of Kinsale. The bye-law has not been proceeded with, because, amongst other reasons, the question of extending the sphere of its operations eastward, towards Queenstown and Ballycotton, has been raised; and the Department intend to hold inquiries at those places during the month of May next, whereupon a decision upon the whole case will be arrived at.

Dromagh Evicted Tenants.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have any further communication to make in regard to the evicted tenants, J. Fitzpatrick and Mrs. Mary Cronin, on the estate of Mr. N. N. Leader, Rosnalee, Dromagh, county Cork; and whether, as the originating application, which included these tenants with the sanction of the landlord, was served in July, 1905, immediate steps will be taken to reinstate them in readiness for spring agricultural work; and further, if Mr. Leader, who has a quantity of untenanted land in his possession, expresses his willingness to sell the same, or a portion thereof, to the Commissioners at a reasonable price, will that body inquire into the question of purchase at an early opportunity with a view to resale of the lands to other evicted tenants of the neighbourhood, to deserving labourers and others entitled under the Land Act of 1903.

Mr. BRYCE: In the Originating Application in respect of the sale of this estate, which was lodged in June, 1905, the former holding of J. Fitzpatrick is set out as untenanted land which the vendor contemplates selling as parcels; and the former holding of Mary Cronin is set out as part of the vendor's demesne, and other land which he proposes to sell to, and repurchase from, the Commissioners. The Commissioners hope soon to be able to make inquiries into the case of these and other evicted tenants in the county Cork.

Kerry County Council and the Irish Land Commissioners.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Kerry County Council a resolution protesting against the unfairness and partiality of many of the present body of Land Commissioners, and asking that competent and impartial men be appointed; and, if so, will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BRYCE: I have received the resolution referred to, but there is no evidence before me to show that, as alleged, many of the present body are open to the charge of unfairness and partiality. When appointments come to be made or renewed, the fitness of all candidates will be carefully considered.

Irish Congested Districts—Compulsory Purchase.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Kerry County Council a resolution appealing to the Government to so amend the Land Act as to give power to the Congested Districts Board to purchase compulsory estates within the congested districts; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BRYCE: I have seen a resolution to the effect stated, which was passed by the Kerry County Council in January, 1905. I am not at present prepared to make any statement on the subject of the resolution.

Evicted Tenants in South Cork.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork Co., S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that no evicted tenant has yet been reinstated in South Cork, steps will immediately be taken to induce the Estates Commissioners to send down an inspector to that constituency to make inquiries and report on the best means for reinstating the evicted tenants in their former holdings.

MR. BRYCE: Inquiries as to all the evicted tenants in county Cork are being prosecuted by the Commissioners as rapidly as possible. The Commissioners understand that some sixteen evicted tenants have recently been reinstated and that negotiations for reinstatement are proceeding in other cases.

Ballykinley Farm, County Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Estates Commissioners will refuse to sanction an advance for the purchase of Ballykinley farm, county Cork (forming the estate of Mr. Palms Spread Morgan, a lunatic), by Captain Jonathan Morgan, remainder man and heir in succession, and will take such steps as may be in their power to bring about the reinstatement of the former tenant, Mr. James J. Greene, evicted in 1889, and who now seeks to become the purchaser of his old holding under the provisions of The Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1903.

MR. BRYCE: An agreement for the purchase of the holding in question by Captain Jonathan Morgan, described as holding under a Court lease, dated December, 1904, was lodged with the Estates Commissioners on the 30th January, 1906. The Commissioners will inquire fully into the circumstances before sanctioning the advance.

Labourers' Cottages in the Mitchelstown Union.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the reason for the refusal of the Local Government Board to sanction a reduction of the rents of labourers' cottages in Mitchelstown union from 1s. to 9d. per week, having regard to the fact that this reduction was passed unanimously by the rural district council, and that the rents of labourers' cottages in the adjacent union of Fermoy are only 7½d. per week; and whether, in view of the necessities of the labourers in the district, the Local Government Board will reconsider the matter and sanction the reduction.

Mr. BRYCE: The sanction of the Local Government Board is not necessary in this matter. The Mitchelstown No. 1 Rural District Council recently asked the Board to sanction the proposed reduction of the rents from 1s. to 9d. a week, but the Board replied that the council must act on their own responsibility and be prepared to satisfy the auditor as to the propriety of their action. If the council have not carried the proposal into effect, it is probable that they fear they cannot, as trustees of the ratepayers, justify the reduction of the rents hitherto charged, seeing that the cottages already entail a heavy burden on the ratepayers.

Mr. Mathew J. Byrne.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that Mr. Matthew J. Byrne was recently employed as temporary horticulturist by the County of Waterford Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, but that the Department refused to sanction his further employment; (2) whether, seeing that the curator of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Glasnevin, reported to the Department that he was perfectly satisfied with Mr. Byrne's technical knowledge of the practical details of gardening and horticultural matters about March, 1905, he will explain why Mr. Byrne was subsequently tested again; (3) whether he is aware that Mr. Byrne's experience has been acquired, not only in the Colonies and the United States, but at the Athy Model Farm and Royal Albert Institute, Glasnevin; (4) that the County Waterford Committee, in December, 1905, gave him a testimonial for his energy and attention to his duties during the six months he had been employed by them, and up to the time at which the Department declined to sanction his permanent appointment; (5) whether he is aware that Mr. Byrne was declared to have failed to pass the second test on the ground that he was unaware of the scientific names of three weeds, one of them being ordinary Scotch grass; (6) and will he say whether Sir Horace Plunkett was aware, when this decision was given, that Mr. Byrne had been connected with the National Registration Association in South Dublin, in which he was an elector.

Mr. BRYCE: (1) The Answer to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. (2) Mr. Byrne was examined a second time, because the Department had promised the Waterford County Committee to make a second test, and because they were not satisfied that he possessed the necessary qualifications. The examiner in the first test had expressed a qualified opinion as to Mr. Byrne's technical knowledge. (3) The Department do not doubt the statement as to Mr. Byrne's previous experience. (4) The Waterford County Committee, at Mr. Byrne's request, gave him a testimonial as to his attention to work, but it is not recorded that the testimonial contained any reference to his fitness. (5) It is not the case that Mr. Byrne was rejected because of his ignorance of the scientific name of weeds. His experience of Irish horticulture had been gained forty years ago before he went abroad. (6) The Answer to the last inquiry is in the negative.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Government to transfer the control of the Royal Irish Constabulary to the county councils.

Mr. BRYCE: No, Sir.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Has the matter been under the consideration of the Government?

Mr. BRYCE: My Answer is in the negative.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Better give the police over to the control of the Orange lodges.

Bellacolla Post Office.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the post office at Ballacolla, Queen's County, is situated on licensed premises; and, if so, is such in accordance with the Post Office Regulations; and what steps he proposes taking in the matter.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The sub-postmaster of Ballacolla, who was appointed in 1887, holds a licence, but the part of the premises used for the post office has a separate entrance, and is completely cut off from the public house. I am informed that the work is carried on in a satisfactory manner. There is a general rule that post offices are not to be situated on licensed premises, but it is sometimes necessary to make exceptions to this rule, and in the circumstances described I do not propose to take any steps in the matter.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Have any inquiries been made with a view to securing more suitable premises?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have not made any with regard to this particular case.

Rules of Procedure.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that 493 Members balloted on Wednesday last; and whether as only a small percentage of Bills introduced by unofficial Members can, under present circumstances, receive even a Second Reading discussion, he will bring forward proposals for amending the Rules of Procedure?

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intends to deal this session with an alteration of the Rules of Procedure of the House; and, if so, in what form such alterations will be submitted?

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend had intended to give notice to-day that he would move on an early date for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the Rules of Procedure, but unfortunately he is confined to the house by a cold.

Traffic in the Metropolis.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will favourably consider the introduction of a Bill this session to give effect to the Report of the Royal Commission, who for the past three years have investigated the question of traffic of the Metropolis; such Bill to provide for the creation of a Traffic Board and other administrative machinery recommended by the Commission?

MR. ASQUITH: His Majesty's Government has not as yet had time to consider the recommendation contained in this very voluminous Report, and it is quite impossible to give any undertaking as to the introduction of legislation during the present session.

Colonial Representation in Foreign Courts.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if any clause will be inserted in the Constitution of the Transvaal Colony to prevent the responsible Government from sending accredited representatives direct to Foreign Powers?

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir, there is no need for such a clause. British diplomatic representatives in foreign countries are accredited by His Majesty and not by any Colonial Government.

Foreign Office Questions.

*EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he has any announcement to make with regard to the future arrangements for answering Questions dealing with foreign affairs.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Perhaps the House will allow me to make my statement a little general, with regard both to answering Questions and to debate. It does require some adjustment and some indulgence on the part of the House to enable me to combine with attendance in the House the work of the Foreign Office. But I have never felt that it was in the interests of the House itself not to give some latitude of that kind, because I think it is in the interests of the House that it should not accept the doctrine that it is impossible for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to be a Member of the House of Commons. I hope that what I now ask the House to accept will leave to it at least as much freedom of effective discussion as it has been the practice for the House to have in recent years. First of all, I would ask the House to bear in mind that both the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister are now in the House of Commons. That, of course, strengthens the House in regard to debate, and as regards debates on Foreign Office questions I shall, of course, so arrange the work of the Office that I shall be always in the House when any foreign question is under discussion. I think it is possible to do that, because debates on foreign affairs are not of excessive frequency, and when they do take place they do not last for more than a day or two days without intermission. With regard to Questions, I do not think it is possible, at any rate without strain and inconvenience, for me to be present in the House on four days every week; and what I would ask the House to accept is an arrangement by which I shall be present on two days in the week. I shall be present in the House, for instance, next Thursday, which, in addition to this day, will be two days this week, and in subsequent weeks I shall be present on Tuesdays and Thursdays. On Mondays and Wednesdays I would ask the House to accept Answers from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board, if it is more convenient to Members to put Questions on foreign affairs on those days. As to supplementary Questions, the late Government asked the House to accept at one time a total restriction, and latterly a very considerable restriction, on such Questions. I assume that they did that because inconvenience had arisen owing to the giving of supplementary Answers. I am quite willing to revert to the original practice of not restricting supplementary Questions so far as I am myself concerned; but the House must bear in mind that a certain risk attaches to supplementary Answers, which are received abroad without full understanding of the circumstances under which they are given, and are scrutinised as considered statements with a deliberate intention behind them. I must therefore ask the House for an equal discretion, so far as I am concerned, as to answering these Questions. I hope the House will accept that arrangement, and will see that under it the liberty of the House will not be in any way interfered with in regard to Foreign Office questions.

*EARL PERCY: May I express our thanks for the courtesy with which the right hon. Gentleman has endeavoured to meet the wishes of the House? The arrangement he now proposes is, I think, the best that could be arrived at under the circumstances. I will only venture to express the hope that the rule as to supplementary Questions not being addressed to the Secretary to the Local Government Board in the absence of the Secretary of State may not be too rigidly adhered to. Something which fell from the Prime Minister the other day seemed to imply that I quarrelled with the arrangement which enabled the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to continue to sit in this House. That was very far from my intention. What I had in my mind was the arrangement by which, when last a Foreign Secretary sat in this House his Under-Secretary sat here also. No one would regret more than myself the withdrawal of the right hon. Gentleman from this House, and I hope he will long continue to take part in our debates.

NEW BILLS.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854," presented by Mr. McCrae; supported by Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. John Dewar, and Mr. Robert Wallace; to be read a second time upon Friday, 23rd March, and to be printed. [Bill 48.]

SALE OF COKE BILL.

"To amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1889, respecting the Sale of Coke," presented by Mr. Rose; supported by Mr. Buckmaster, Mr. Beck, and Mr. Montagu; to be read a second time upon Friday, 11th May, and to be printed. [Bill 49.]

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY BILL.

"To continue the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1904," presented by Mr. Buxton; supported by Mr. McKenna; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 50.]

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To give the ratepayers a direct Veto on the Liquor Traffic in their respective areas in Scotland," presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett; supported by Mr. A. W. Black, Mr. Crombie, Mr. John Hope, Mr. M'Callum, Mr. Robert Wallace, and Mr. Eugene Wason; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 51.]

PLACES OF WORSHIP (SITES) BILL.

"To give further facilities for the acquisition of Sites for Places of Worship," presented by Mr. Perks; supported by Mr. McArthur and Mr. Broadhurst; to be read a second time upon Friday, 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 52.]

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) PREVENTION AND COMPENSATION BILL.

"To provide for the payment of compensation to the owners of animals condemned after slaughter and destroyed by order of a magistrate on account of tuberculosis, and to assist in the prevention of tuberculosis," presented by Mr. Field; supported by Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Roche, Mr. Condon, Mr. Rutherford, Sir Carne Rasch, Mr. Jones, Mr. Skackleton, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. MacIver; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 6th March, and to be printed. [Bill 53.]

CLOSURING THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I rise to ask a Question about the conduct of the business of the House. In the absence of the Prime Minister, I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the intentions of the Government with regard to the debate on the Address. The Prime Minister has given notice to suspend the twelve o'clock rule to-night. At this early period of the session that constitutes a record. I assume it is not intended to keep us up late. On the Address only two Amendments have been dealt with, and there are a number still down on the Paper, some of which are of special importance. I regard as of special importance those standing in the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney and also the one standing in the name of the hon. Member for Hoxton. I have no idea how long the first Amendment dealing with Indian administration will last, but, supposing with every good will on all sides of the House, we are unable to complete the debate by twelve o'clock, I hope it is not the intention of the Government to close the Address prematurely.

MR. ASQUITH: It is certainly the intention of the Government to ask the House to come to a conclusion on the Address to-night. The Government, having carefully considered the character of the various Amendments down on the Paper, and the amount of time which might fairly be devoted to each one, have come to the conclusion that every topic will have an opportunity of being adequately discussed, and it is certainly their intention to ask the House to conclude the debate to-night. Under no other conditions can the necessary financial business be completed by March 31st.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: After that statement, we shall oppose both Government Resolutions.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the King's Speech (Motion for an Address), if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Orders (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 343; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 3.)

AYES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenr
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)

Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Codfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. G.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hiliare Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W (T'w'r H'mlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm J (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grin'td
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randall
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davis, W. Howell, (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (G'lw'y
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Invernes-sh.)
Dickinson, W H (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hyn. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward, (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawny
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W Bateman (S'merset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Charles (Donegal, E
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick, A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alfred
Money, L. G. Chiozza-
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Moss, Samuel
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nuttall Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.

O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philpps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford. E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas(W. M'nm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'tn
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robartes, Hn. T. C. A. (Bodmin)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robertson, SirG. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir W. Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Charles D (Hyde)
Schwann, C. E. (Manchester, N.)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles, Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, B. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, E. P. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J. W H(Somerset, E.
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles, Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker. H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (S'thampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, W. L. (Carmarthen)
Williamson, A. (Elgin and Nairn
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk, Mid.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. George Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord J. P. J. (Stamford)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James(Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, Sir W Evans-(T'r. Ham.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S, Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Marks, Harry Hananel (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, Major E. C.
Nield, Herbert
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Thomson, W. M. (Lanark, N. W
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on main Question [19th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign.*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your

Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

UNREST IN INDIA AND PARTITION OF BENGAL.

*MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he was sure that in bringing his Amendment before the House he would be treated with consideration by the many hon. Members who were new to the House but who had a wide knowledge of Indian affairs. The Amendment drew attention, in the first place, to the widespread dissatisfaction and unrest in India due to the recent policy of the Government, culminating in the partition of Bengal, and went on to set forth the opinion that such modifications should be made in the form of administration in Bengal as would tend to allay the existing discontent. Lastly, it expressed the hope that the Government would consider the reasonable demands of the Indian people for a larger share in the administration of their own affairs. It was not necessary for him to say that this Amendment was not moved in any hostile sense to the present Government. They, on the Ministerial side of the House, had the fullest confidence that his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India and the Government to which the right hon. Gentleman belonged would, as far as practicable, reflect in their Indian policy the great change that had come over this country as revealed by the General Election. They were met with the fact that this dissatisfaction and unrest existed to a wide extent in India at the present moment, and it was felt that a declaration of the policy of His Majesty's Government should be made—not in regard to details, because that would be absolutely impossible, seeing that the Government had been in office for so short a time—but a declaration of the spirit of that policy which they believed would be of great value in India at the present day in allaying the existing tension of the situation. He would deal, in the first place, with the partition of Bengal only in outline, leaving to those who had personal local knowledge of the conditions of the situation to dea with the details. By the provisions of the Order for the partition, Bengal was divided into two. Eastern Bengal was added to Assam and a new province was formed under a Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam. The main ground alleged for this change was that it was necessary because of the increased burdens of administration in Bengal, and the impossibility of maintaining in the circumstances a high standard of efficiency. Now that proposition was not assented to by those who had the largest experience of the facts of the case. But he ventured to make to the House this proposition, that even if it were desirable on administrative grounds to divide Bengal and readjust the boundaries, surely when there was more than one alternative plan, it was unjust that that particular one which aroused discontent and indignation among the whole population connected with it should have been adopted. It should be remembered that this matter had been discussed in India for some years, but only in 1903 were formal proposals made. Definite action, however, was not taken by the Government of India till twelve months afterwards. Immediately the scheme for partition met with the strongest opposition in all parts of the province. Undeterred by this, the Government proceeded with their plans, and in February following the Indian Government sent home a despatch containing their proposals to Mr. Brodrick, then Secretary for India. On June 9th last year a despatch was sent back to India practically sanctioning these proposals. Now, a few days after the late Government had sent the despatch to the Indian Government assenting to their proposals, the annual debate on the Indian Budget took place, and was it not rather strange that, notwithstanding the fact that the agitation against them in India was then at its height, not a single word was said in the debate by the then Secretary for India to indicate that the Home Government had approved of any scheme for the partition of Bengal? Indeed, the House of Commons knew nothing of the scheme officially until the early days of August last, when the announcement of the proclamation bringing the scheme into operation was made. On August 9th he moved the Adjournment of the House on the question, and pressed the Government of the day to postpone the operation of the Order until they had further information. During that debate his right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton, who was Secretary for India in the last Liberal Administration, pleaded that he was not at that time sufficiently informed on the subject to vote in the pending division, although the right hon. Gentleman indicated what his opinion might possibly be; and then in weighty words he urged Mr. Brodrick to postpone the operation of the Order and to give further Papers. On the undertaking that the operation of the Order would be so postponed he (Mr. Herbert Roberts) withdrew his Motion for the Adjournment of the House. What was his surprise, therefore, some time in September, to find from the papers the announcement that the Order for the partition of Bengal would come into operation on October 16th. He immediately wrote to Mr. Brodrick, protesting against the proposal, and asking him to postpone the operation of the Order until the further Papers promised had been presented to Parliament. Mr. Brodrick was not now in the House of Commons to explain, and he did not desire to say more than to repeat that the impression made on his mind and on others by the undertaking of Mr. Brodrick was that the operation of the Order would be postponed until the House of Commons had had the information desired. He could not understand what object could be served by promising to give further information if at the time it had been definitely decided not to postpone the operation of the Order, knowing as they did what the obvious effect would be in Bengal. It created a sense of injustice, brought forth the fruit of widespread discontent, an alienation of feeling and friction. Every conceivable constitutional device had been adopted for the purpose of bringing before the Government of India the mind of the people of Bengal and their deep-rooted objection to this Order. Petitions had been presented; public meetings had been held in all parts of the country in opposition to it. Another direct consequence of the policy of the Government was that it produced retaliation on the part of the people concerned in trade matters by the boycotting of Manchester goods, and the spread and stimulation of the Swadeshi movement for the consumption of home-made goods. He could only say that these were signs which ought not to be passed lightly by Parliament; and he was glad to have the opportunity of bringing this Amendment before the House, in order that anything said here might tend to allay the agitation. Another effect of the Order, much to be regretted, had been the action of the Government in attempting to suppress the agitation. The *Statesman*, a journal well known for its unswerving loyalty to the Indian Government recently said—

> "The successive Orders issued by Mr. Fuller had been designed to take away the right of public meeting."

(Mr. Fuller was the Lieutenant-Governor of the Eastern Division of Bengal.)

> "Goorkhas had been quartered upon the people, and a campaign of suppression continued which in any other part of India would have resulted in dangerous rioting."

He hoped that it would be possible for his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India to say something on this case which would tend to lessen the agitation against the Order. The third and last question which might be asked was, "What was there in this Order to cause such a tempest of feeling?" His right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton, in the debate which took place in August last on this question, pointed out how in our own country the greatest excitement very frequently arose over questions relating to the transfer of boundaries in municipalities and in some country districts, and that these rose into grave matters. Might he point out that the case of the partition of Bengal was not one relating to a small municipality or country district? Bengal was the premier province of India. Considerations arose of race, language, intellectual development, historical associations, national aspirations. All those things had combined to create in the mind of the people of Bengal an intense pride in the land of their birth. They were proud of the capital—Calcutta—which was not only the capital of Bengal but the metropolis of India; and they saw in this division of the province a blow at the fame of their city. This question of partition could not be looked upon from one standpoint alone. It must be remembered that it was but the culmination of a series of measures which, say what they liked, were interpreted by the people of India to mean a desire on the part of the Government to repress, curtail, and prevent future agitation. It was thought that that was the motive which underlay this Order. It was the general impression of the people of India that the aim and object of this Order dividing the Province of Bengal was to weaken the political power of that Province. In support of this idea, there was one sentence in the despatch of the Government of India dated April 9th, 1905, which seemed to corroborate that view—

"It cannot,"

says the Government of India,

"be for the lasting good of any country that public opinion, or what passes for public opinion, should be manufactured by a comparatively small number of people at a single centre, and should be disseminated for universal consumption."

He put it to the House without distinction of Party or nationality that those words clearly conveyed the impression that the underlying motive of the policy carried out by the Partition Order was to do something to weaken the power of Calcutta and Bengal. Another thing to be added to these considerations was the hurried way in which this Order was passed, a fact which was recognised by the dispatch of Mr. Brodrick of July 9th, where it is admitted that the scheme in its complete form had not been laid before the public officials. Lastly, they must remember that in its final form this scheme was never discussed by the House of Commons, and the cumulative evidence of all these facts went far to explain why this widespread and deep-rooted agitation in Bengal and India had arisen against this Partition Order. It may be asked what alternative proposition was to be made? He desired to leave any suggested proposal to be considered by the Government to his hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham, who in this matter, he thought, had almost a unique experience in regard to the conditions of the Government of Bengal; but he would like to say, before he left the matter, that he for one recognised to the full that the Order having been passed and the partition having been made, it was essential that in any modification which might be found possible by the House, care should be taken to disturb as little as possible the administrative machinery which had been already formed under the Order. As to the second part of the Amendment, namely, that

"The reasonable demands of the Indian people for a larger share in the administration of their affairs should receive the consideration of the Government,"

he thought they were fortunate on this occasion in having those demands outlined for them by the President of the Indian National Congress in his Presidential address in December of last year. They were of a reasonable kind and could be summarised under four heads: (1) that the number of elected members upon the Viceroy's Council should be increased to twelve, out of a total of twenty-five; (2) that the number of elected members on the Legislative Council should be increased; (3) with the appointment of three Indian representatives upon the Secretary of State's Council; and lastly, that advisory Boards for consultative purposes should be established in all districts in India. All that was asked for was that the representative members should be increased; a majority was not asked for. The only representation invited was such as would secure that the Indian point of view should be put forward in the discussion and settlement of matters of local administration. What, briefly, were the steps which had led up to the present demand for further powers of self-government in India? The foundation was to be found in the historic phrase in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858; then twenty years ago there was the founding of the Indian Congress. Then came the Indian Councils Act of 1892—a great step forward in the direction which he was suggesting should be followed at the present time. All that the Amendment really asked for now was that there should be an extension of the principle laid down and conceded by the

Indian Councils Act of 1892. Since 1892 education had been progressing in India and Western ideas had been more impressed upon the natives. At the same time they recognised that we must proceed slowly step by step and in accordance with the conditions of the case. The present conditions of life in India were the result of fifty years of development and British rule. But there was a matter which must be taken into account, and that was the rise of an Eastern power, which had created a great impression upon the mind and spirit of India. Whatever view hon. Members took of the ultimate goal of our rule in India, let this House recognise facts; let them endeavour to understand the views and wishes of India and let them make it clear that their desire in the future was to win the co-operation and not the hostility of the masses we governed in India. Some people took the view that the extension of the powers of local self-government in India might lead to the loss of India. If that were true, which he emphatically denied, the continuance of the present policy would likewise have the same result. One thing he would suggest to the House was that we required in India to have the same qualities of courage, foresight and statesmanship in order to adapt ourselves to the existing conditions, and work out the problems which now faced us in India, as were required by our forefathers in winning India, and constructing a government in that country which was the pride of the British nation. There was one fine phrase used by Burke on India worth remembering—

> "The situation of the man is the preceptor of his duty."

They desired to recognise the changes that were taking place in India, and recognising these facts to decide their future policy. His right hon friend the Secretary of State for India many years ago wrote a life of Burke in which there was one sentence which ran—

> "The lesson of the Warren Hastings impeachment had been taught with sufficiently expressive force. *It was that Asiatics have rights, Europeans obligations, and that the authority of the English Legislative* is not more certainly a trust for the benefit of this country than is the dominion of the English in India a trust for the inhabitants of India."

Sixty years ago Macaulay said from his place in this House these memorable words—

> "The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system until it has outgrown our system; that by good government we may educate our subjects with a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will come I know not, but never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in England's history."

In conclusion, he expressed his deep conviction that if we proceeded wisely and cautiously in this direction, any step which we took would not be one leading to separation, but would be another link in the chain binding the people of India to the throne and the people of this country. He begged to move.

*Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) seconded the Amendment, and as a new Member craved the indulgence which was always accorded by the House under such circumstances. He had, he said, at least one claim for trespassing so early upon the time of the House in that he had spent many long years of faithful service under the Crown in India, and had acquired an experience in the affairs of that country which entitled him to express an opinion for the consideration of the House. More than that, he had acquired in a degree which was rare, if not as he believed unprecedented, the confidence and trust of the Indian people, who had appointed him in no informal manner their mouthpiece in this House, especially on such occasions as the present, when their interests and matters in which they were vitally concerned were being discussed. Sympathy was the keynote of successful administration in India The people of India were the most grateful people in the world. It had often surprised him to observe how splendidly they had recognised on many occasions the services of Englishmen who had, indeed, done nothing for them beyond their mere duty. When Lord Curzon returned to India after the expiration of the first period of his

Vice-Royalty, he said to the natives of Bombay—

> "I pray the native community to believe in the good faith and high honour and the integrity of Englishmen."

The people of India did place implicit trust in this country. There was also no question of the loyalty, absolutely none, of the educated classes of the people of India. With the permission of the House he would recall an incident which lately occurred during the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to India. He noted in this connection the expression in the King's most gracious Speech, in which he said—

> "The reception which the Prince and Princess of Wales have met with from all classes has been most gratifying to me, and I trust their visit will tend to strengthen among my subjects in India the feeling of loyalty to the Crown and attachment to this country."

Those words were true. The result of the visit had been to strengthen that feeling of attachment and loyalty which the people of India felt and have always felt towards England. A gentleman whose name would be unknown to this House, but who had for forty years been one of the leaders of the party of advanced thought—the party which had urged reforms on the Government, had unsparingly criticised men and measures, and was regarded with suspicion by the late administration—was brought into contact with His Royal Highness and, somewhat to his surprise, introduced to him. He fell upon his knees and with folded hands, after the Oriental manner, in faltering accents protested loyalty and devotion to the Crown and this country. That action on the part of one who had been unjustly charged with disloyalty was a very remarkable one, because it was the strongest evidence of the goodwill and loyalty which lay at the heart of the educated Indian people. The Indian people were loyal and were grateful for the education with which they had been endowed, and for the liberty they enjoyed; and they were grateful for their immunity from invasion. But that gratitude was tempered by the feeling that the pledges held out to them by the late Queen Victoria in her Proclamation and by men in exalted positions, had not been fulfilled. The position of India now was different from what it was a generation or two previously. The people had acquired aspirations and hoped to take an active and dominant part in the administration and government of their country; they had now reached the parting of the ways. We had given education to the people of India, and it was impossible now to go on indefinitely refusing the concessions they demanded. Year by year we had been turning out from the universities men with the best education we could give, engendering in their minds western habits of thought and kindling in their hearts many aspirations. The duty of administration in India was a comparatively easy one. It was easy to administer the affairs of a docile and subject people. There was no country—and he spoke from long experience, having been charged with the administration of a province—more easy to administer than India, because the people were so docile, law-abiding and amenable, but something more than mere administration was wanted now. Instead of merely administering provinces, the Government would have now to raise India, under our sway, into a great Empire, foster and protect the patriotic tendencies of the people, and to exercise that quality of statesmanship which the late John Bright in a memorable speech described as "foreseeing." It was necessary not only to appreciate the changes that had taken place but to prepare for further changes. Lord Ripon was the most benevolent and popular Viceroy that India had ever seen. He justly urged on behalf of a scheme of local self-government that it would be an instalment of political education. The period of Lord Ripon was the golden age of Indian reformers, and he was supported by some of the ablest of English administrators, in particular by Sir Evelyn Baring, now Lord Cromer, who had never wavered from the views he expressed more than twenty years ago on behalf of enlarging the liberties of the Indian people and by the present Clerk of this House. Under Lord Ripon and his able and sympathetic advisers education was encouraged, liberties fostered, and the foundation of Indian nationality firmly laid. They had read in the columns of *The Times* that we must wearily retrace our steps and devote ourselves to educating the Indians in character and common-sense; that then, and not till then, could we admit them into the politecture of self-government; that we must wait until gėneration after generation of educated Indians had come and gone. This was but the vapouring of reaction; all this was canting sentiment. A system of government which deliberately excluded the people from power was more efficacious in depressing their character than all our laws and school books could be in elevating it. British officials in India had a great and unexampled sphere of work before them. But, however great might be their energy and activity, it counted as dross if they lacked the higher genius of training the people by making them work for themselves, of evoking their powers by affording them opportunities for their exercise, and of raising them from a condition of mere passive subjection to a capacity for the discharge of higher responsibilities. No system of administration could be progressive or beneficial which did not foster the self-reliance of the people and encourage their aspirations to realise their destiny through their own exertions. They had known what it was in England to witness a policy of re-action They had passed through some seventeen years during which many reactionary measures had been forced on a reluctant people. The echo of this reaction had extended to India, and, in the terms of the Amendment, it had excited widespread dissatisfaction and unrest, which was a source of danger in India, and, which could not but be regarded with great apprehension. He would summarise the reactionary tendencies to which he had referred, and which had gone on for the last ten years or more. They had seen legislation designed to curtail the liberty of the Press and speech; they had seen a crusade against so-called sedition, which was wisely allowed to die out; they had witnessed an attempt to abolish trial by jury, which fortunately failed; they had seen blows dealt at local self-government, especially in Calcutta, where, in total disregard of repeated and emphatic expressions of public opinion, a long-standing and successful system of representative municipal administration had been swept away. They had witnessed the open declaration of race disqualification for public offices, a general trend of policy to exclude the children of the soil from positions of trust and responsibility, and to deny them the opportunities of acquiring the qualifications necessary in the posts monopolised by Englishmen. They had seen the substitution of nomination for appointments in the place of competitive examinations. They had seen a policy of knitting together still more tightly the bonds of official control over departments of education. These and other similar measures of a reactionary or retrograde tendency had galvanised the people into a condition of dissatisfaction and unrest. But all these measures might not have led to the condition of affairs which now prevailed in India. They had culminated in the measure known as the partition of Bengal. There was an old history attaching to the partition. It began so long ago as 1892, when it was proposed to separate a portion of the province and add it to Assam, on the ground that it was desirable that the whole of the north-east frontier of India should be placed under one administration. Not much came of that at the time, but in 1896, when he was himself at the head of the administration of Assam this question came up again, and on behalf of the province he agreed to the proposal that the control over the wild and savage tribes on the north-east frontier should be transferred from Bengal to Assam, but he gave good reasons for objecting to any transfer of what were called the regulation portions of the Province. His arguments prevailed, and nothing was done so long as he remained in India. But in December, 1903, certain proposals were put forward for dividing the province of Bengal—for annexing a considerable portion of the regulation districts to Assam. As soon as the proposal was put forward it was met with a perfect tornado of opposition. Meetings were held everywhere, memorials were submitted, and the whole country-side was roused. Lord Curzon then visited the affected districts, and made three speeches in different places, in which he endeavoured to subdue the agitation, but at the same time he adumbrated a much larger scheme of partition—one which proposed to divide Bengal in a more decisive manner than had hitherto been contemplated. These proposals, far from palliating, further excited the feeling in the country and protests continued without stint or stay, but no official—no public—utterance was ever made in India intimating to the people of the country what was definitely proposed. All the deliberations that took place were behind the back of the people. It was not till February, 1905, that a despatch was sent to His Majesty's Secretary of State. The people of India had no idea of what was contained in the despatch. He happened to be in India revisiting the country at that time, and he well remembered the fever of excitement which prevailed with regard to the policy which the Government of India intended to follow. In the Legislative Council questions were poured in. No answer was given. Memorials were addressed to the Government, but no reply was received. It was thought by a credulous people that the Government were actually prepared in deference to public opinion to abandon the scheme of partition which had been so injudiciously proposed. Vain hope! This despatch was sent, and after due delay the late Secretary of State for India replied to it on June 9th, and very soon after the arrival of this despatch telegrams appeared in the papers intimating that His Majesty's Ministers had approved of the partition of Bengal. Then all the outbreak burst forth again. There were public meetings—the largest, the most influential, the most enthusiastic, he supposed, that had ever been held in India, to protest against what had been done—done behind the people's backs, in the dark. And then the Government of India published a resolution of July 19th indicating the steps which it had been resolved on to take in regard to the division of Bengal. Further protests went on in India, and it was with reference to this agitation that the debate, which his hon. friend who moved this Amendment referred to, took place in this House. He listened to the debate on that occasion, though not on the floor of this House, and certainly the impression left on his mind was the same as that which was shared by his hon. friend, and after hearing the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, he certainly understood that Mr. Brodrick's reply gave a definite pledge that until the House was in possession of the facts of the case, and could consider the question from both sides, no further steps would be taken to press on the partition of Bengal. They all knew that no notice whatever was taken by the late Secretary of State of the debate in this House, and as early as September 1st a proclamation was issued in India stating that all the present arrangements regarding the partition were definitely and finally settled, and that the partition would take place on October 16th, and this was promptly followed by special legislation at Simla—a most unusual step, because legislation at Simla ordinarily took place only when uncontested, uncontentious matter was under consideration. Here was a question which had aroused Indian feeling to a degree unparalleled within his experience of the country, and the Government of India actually proceeded to legislation at Simla when not a single Indian Member was present in Council. He hoped he had given some indication of the strong feeling which prevailed in India. There had been many meetings to protest and many telegrams had been despatched to the Secretary of State for India. These meetings had been held in almost every village of the province, and never in the history of India had there been such evidence of public feeling as there had been in regard to this partition. All classes of the community were represented in these protests. He might be told that the Mahommedans had not joined with the Hindoos. To a partial extent that was true, but the great majority of the Mahommedan community were absolutely at one with the Hindoos in this matter. This was not a matter in which it had been found possible to arouse any sectarian animosity. It was alleged, and he hoped it was not true, that the policy of the Indian Government had been to create and to encourage these differences of opinion between Hindoos and Mahommedans. He could not believe that there was any foundation for such a charge. There were many traces of this policy at the present moment, and certainly everything was being done and pressed forward to bring the Mahommedans into evidence as against the Hindoos, but that movement had failed because the great mass of the Mahommedans were at one with the Hindoos. He might point out that this agitation was not confined to the educated classes of the country, but all classes were affected by it. The shopkeepers and the agriculturists alike were affected, and this agitation had found its way into the heart of the nation. There never was a movement so thoroughly popular in India of its character. It was idle to say that it was dying out, because it was not. During the past month the agitation had been stronger than ever. On January 31st last one of the most sober and distinguished of Bengalee gentlemen, who had received the title of Rajah, when he addressed a crowded audience, said—

> "How could we talk of peace when there was no peace?"

Those words echoed the feelings and sentiments of all present at that meeting, and indeed of the whole of Bengal. What was the reason put forward for this partition? They were always given an administrative reason, and it was that the province of Bengal was too large and possessed too great a population for one man to administer. He admitted that the Government of Bengal was a very heavy and arduous charge. Upon this point he could speak with as much authority and as much knowledge as most people, for although he had not himself held the high dignity of Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, he had been Under-Secretary and Chief Secretary to seven successive Lieutenant-Governors, and he had been more closely associated with the Government of Bengal for a long period than any other officer of his time in India. Consequently he could speak with some authority upon this question of excessive work and excessive responsibility imposed upon the Lieutenant-Governor. He did not hesitate to say that the work of a Lieutenant-Governor at the present time was actually lighter than it was twenty or thirty years ago. The reason of this was that the whole country had changed during those thirty years. It was nearly forty years ago since he first entered the Bengal Civil Service, and in those days the difficulties of moving about the country, of getting in touch with the people, of consulting officers and others responsible for the administration in different parts of the country, were almost insuperable. A Lieutenant-Governor had to spend a great deal of time in travelling at great personal discomfort to himself in all parts of the province. Now they had the telegraph and railways in every direction, and they could go in a few hours' time distances which formerly took two, three, or even four days. He thought this was a sufficient explanation by itself as to why the work and responsibility was lighter to-day than it used to be. He admitted that new interests had arisen, and that in other ways there might be more to do for a Lieutenant-Governor, but taken altogether the work was really less. It had never been found that any member of the Bengal Civil Service, who had been promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Governor—that was to say any member of the service who had had previous service in Bengal—had ever complained of excessive work, and the complaint had always come from members of the Civil Service who had been transferred to Bengal from other parts of India. It had been too much the habit to appoint to the Lieutenant-Governorship officers belonging to other services. That practice did not prevail in other provinces so much, but those men who had been so transferred to Bengal were the only men who complained of being overworked. No doubt they were overworked, and they learned the work at great sacrifice and at the cost of the people. They frittered away their time in petty details and small matters of administration which ought to have been left to their subordinates, but which they found it necessary to take up in order to learn something about the country over whose affairs it was their place to exercise authority. So much for the argument of overwork, but the real reason for the partition of Bengal was, he regretted to say, of a very different character. It was no mere administrative reason that lay at the root of the partition scheme. That scheme was part and parcel of a policy intended to destroy political responsibility and to crush the patriotism of the Indian people. The Bengalee race, with all their faults, were the principal section of the community who had inspired the new national patriotism in which was centred the hope and destiny of their country. This partition was designed to weaken the Bengalee ascendancy. The object of the partition was to strike a blow at an intelligence and enterprise which had taken a form which the officials did not approve of. Upon this point he would quote again the words from the despatch of February, 1905, which had been quoted by his hon. friend—

> "It cannot be for the lasting good of any country that public opinion, or what passes as public opinion, should be manufactured by a comparatively small number of people at a single centre and then disseminated for universal consumption."

These words explained clearly enough the political object which the Government of India had in view. He had heard this partition described by a right hon. Gentleman who was lately the Secretary for India—he alluded to Lord George Hamilton, who personally he much regretted was not still in the House of Commons, and therefore unable to take part in this debate—as a "mere duplication of administrative machinery." There was no foundation whatever for such an assertion. What was a duplication of administrative machinery? What did it mean? In the House of Commons it would mean that they would have two Speakers instead of one, for that would be a duplication of their administrative machinery. But what had been done in Bengal was to create two separate Governments, with separate executive powers, separate legislative power, separate laws, and a separate administration. How they could possibly call that a duplication of administrative machinery passed his comprehension altogether. It had been compared to the division of the Ridings of Yorkshire, where no separate governments on separate administration existed. A more accurate comparison would be the division of Scotland into two parts under separate Viceroys. Imagine what would be the result if any such proposals were put forward! But they have not only been put forward but actually carried into effect in Bengal. The result had been the irritation which he had described. The wish of the people of Bengal was that the old state of things should be restored, and that they might still be placed under one Government. He confessed that he shared the feeling expressed by his hon. friend, that practical considerations would render any such arrangement extremely difficult. It was very difficult indeed to undo what had once been done, and that was an experience which His Majesty's Ministers were having in more than one direction. It was not easy to undo the partition of Bengal, but it was possible to meet the feeling in India by some modification of the existing arrangement which would proceed along the line of least resistance. He hoped the Government would give that proposal their most earnest consideration. Now there was a new Lieutenant-Governor, new commissioners, a new board of revenue, new secretaries, new heads of departments. A great many agreeable appointments had been created, the cancelling of which would be extremely unpleasant to the incumbents. He went so far as to say that it was almost impracticable, all things considered, to abolish the partition of the Province. The proposal he had to make was that Bengal proper should be left alone, that there should be no partition of the Bengali-speaking races of the province, and that in order to provide for the new officials there should be created a new province in the western direction of Bengal, establishing as the capital of that province the ancient city of Patna, and including within that province the whole of Behar and Chota Nagpore. This would comprise an area of 80,000 miles and a population of well over 30,000,000. The whole of this would be practically a Hindustani-speaking area. There was a wide difference between Behar and Bengal. One was Hindustani and the other Bengali. Possibly that definition would convey no impression or meaning to the House. It meant that the people spoke different languages, that they did not intermarry, and that their food and diet were different. The Hindustanis were not a rice-eating people like the inhabitants of Bengal. He urged the Government to leave Bengal alone and undisturbed and that the paraphernalia of the new Government should be transferred from Dacca, which was Bengali to the very roots, to Behar. He further suggested that it might be convenient to add to Behar the province and division of Benares, which most closely resembled Behar. In fact there was no difference whatever between the natives of Benares and Behar. In that case the population would be no less than 42,000,000, which would make a new large central province which would be known as Behar. Bengal would consist of the Bengali-speaking people, and to it it would be necessary to add Assam. Assam was the province of which he was chief commissioner for six years, and he thought he could speak with some authority when he said it was desirable that it should go back again to Bengal, to which it formerly belonged. It was separated in 1874, and if the truth was to be told the separation had never been a very great success. In order to meet the special conditions of that province, with its wide frontier and various tribes, which required special knowledge, and in order to deal also with the large tea industry which was in Assam, it was desirable that the commissioner of that province should be vested with special powers—such powers as were to be found working advantageously in other parts of India where somewhat similar conditions existed. He referred particularly to the province of Scinde, where the Governor of Bombay delegated his powers by statute and was relieved practically of direct responsibility for the administration of that province, only the more important and larger questions coming before him for his consideration. That was the proposal he had to make in regard to the new province. He was convinced, however, that the desire in India in favour of the appointment of a Governor and Council for the old province would not be modified by the mere acceptance of the proposals he had put forward. The appointment of a Governor and Council in Bengal had always been contemplated. Under the Statute of 1853 a temporary arrangement was made, which was to prevail only until the Governor and Council should be appointed. He had intended to deal with the reasons why the appointment of a Governor and Council was necessary, but having already trespassed unduly on the time of the House, he would not do so now. Perhaps he would have other opportunities of discussing the matter with the representatives of the Government in the India Office. It was a most important question, and he trusted it would receive most careful consideration.

Amendment moved—

"At end of the Question to add the words, 'But we humbly beg to represent to Your Majesty that this House regards with concern the wide-spread dissatisfaction and unrest of India due to the recent policy of the Government, culminating in the partition of Bengal, and is of opinion that such modifications should be made in the form of administration in Bengal as will tend to allay the existing discontent; and we further beg to represent to Your Majesty that the reasonable demands of the Indian people for a larger share in the administration of their affairs should receive the consideration of the Government.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed—"That those words be there added."

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said he had no intention of referring to the matters relating to Bengal, having little official or local knowledge of the questions connected with the partition of the province. He would deal chiefly with the second part of the Amendment, and in doing so he would endeavour to say nothing which would embarrass a sympathetic Government or introduce contentious matter to which hon. Members opposite could object, for he thought in a new Parliament he might quote what was said by an eminent man some years ago, namely, that they were all Members of Parliament for India nomatter where they sat. He thought it had been conceded time after time in this House and in the country by both of the great political Parties that the natives of India should be employed in the administration of the country as much as possible and as far as was consistent with good government. He need not argue that principle this afternoon. He dared say hon. Members had heard that the more they gave the educated Indian natives the more they would want. No doubt that was the case, but it was not alone among Indians that this result was found. It was, naturally enough, the effect of an education extending over a hundred years. It was also reasonable as the value of the services of the natives of India had been proved in every department of the Government; and, coming particularly to higher matters of statesmanship, it was, he believed, expedient and statesmanlike for the Government to lend a sympathetic ear to these aspirations. When one thought of the numerous languages and dialects of India, its various castes, its manifold customs and manners, its different systems of property and hereditary rights, it had to be conceded that what is needed in our administration at all times is competent knowledge and general sympathy. A distinguished Governor, Sir John Malcolm, had said that those responsible for pointing indiscriminate abuse at the people of India were usually deficient in a full knowledge of their language; that Europeans could never pretend to that familiarity with the native dialects such as native gentlemen possessed. He himself had been associated for years with native Indian judges in the High Courts, men of high reputation, great learning and versatile capacity. The same sort of persons were found in the Legislative Councils and would be of much usefulness if admitted into the Executive Government at the various Presidencies. In those Executive Councils the same qualifications would be valuable, learning in the law, knowledge of facts, power to adjudge on evidence, the understanding of native subordinates and their character, the familiarity with native aspirations and dislikes. There was another quality which they possessed which was very valuable, both in matters of justice and in administration—a talent which he believed made Scotsmen such acceptable Members of this House. They had the power of listening. People in India explained why the Government officials had been provided by a kind Providence with two ears; it was that there was one for the plaintiff and another for the defendant. He therefore supported the Amendment.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he would not have interfered in the debate in so far as the question of the partition of Bengal was concerned, had he not thought it necessary that something should be said by some person conversant with India, and not taking the line of the hon. Member for East Nottingham. He would not deny that there was a strong public opinion against this measure in Bengal, and that it had been exhibited in a legitimate manner in the Press and at public meetings. He went further, and admitted that there was a national feeling in Bengal which had grown up because it was believed that the existing system was of benefit to Bengal, the Bengalis, and Calcutta. He likewise admitted that the Chamber of Commerce of Calcutta—a body capable of expressing an opinion of great value—was opposed to this partition, and that that opinion was shared by the European Trades Association, although he did not understand that their objection was exceedingly strong or insuperable. But there was another class who were interested in this matter to whom the hon. Member for East Nottingham had not referred. He meant the planting class. He had made inquiry and had special means of finding out that the planting class were not averse from this measure. On the contrary, they approved of it. It was their interest that coolies should be obtained for labour in the tea-gardens; and he ventured to say that if the Bengal Government had erred in any way in this matter it was in that they had been protecting the coolies too much to their own disadvantage. For the coolies who had gone as labourers to the tea-gardens had taken the opportunities they had of acquiring land and settling in the neighbourhood of the gardens. That showed that they had been well-treated by the planters, who were just and generous employers of labour. It was said that the people of Bengal would never be satisfied until they had a Governor and a Council like Madras and Bombay. He had some knowledge of Presidency government, and believed the system to be so bad that it had only been possible to work it because the men were so good. Since the seat on the Council of the Commander-in-Chief had been abolished, the Governor might be in a minority for his whole term of five years. This was a system which had strained the abilities of Warren Hastings, and though it would ill become him to say that the Presidency Governors were not able men—indeed he held exactly the opposite opinion—yet it might safely be assumed, that they had not been, and would not be, superior to Warren Hastings. The hon. Member for East Nottingham had made a claim which he was bound to deprecate; viz., that he represented the people of India. Hon. Members in this House were only representatives of their constituencies, and any other position that was given to them would be entirely due to the knowledge of the subject under discussion and their handling of it. He would put against the experience of the hon. Member for East Nottingham, as Secretary and Under-Secretary in Bengal, the experience of Sir Charles Elliott, who had been Lieut.-Governor of Bengal, and an exceedingly capable Governor who said it was the one office he had held in India in regard to which he was unable to say that he had done his daily duty as he would have liked to have done it. It was impossible to adopt the opinion of any one officer on this subject and the officer whose experience had been in one province was less likely to form a correct judgment than one who had filled many offices in many provinces. He held it unnecessary and unwise to discuss this measure here, because of the use which would be made of the discussion in India. In common with the mover and seconder he wished that the matter had not been pursued until Papers had been laid, and the way in which the matter had throughout been conducted no doubt exacerberated the feelings of those concerned. It was also unusual that the measure should have been passed at Simla, but however carried, it had become an accomplished fact. The opinion of the planters deserved, however, the special consideration of this House. They had never been guilty of any cruelty to their employees, or of any conduct towards them of which complaint could be made. The measure might have been carried in a somewhat more public manner, but it was possible that if it had been communicated to those who were concerned there would have been difficulty in passing it. He did not say it was hurried through for that reason, but he thought that the feelings of the Bengalese in this matter did not receive due consideration. In discussing the further employment of the natives of India he did not want to indicate to-day what particular offices should be given them. That seemed as futile as any attempt to carve India into new provinces this afternoon in this House. But he thought more might be done in that direction. The Indians made most admirable judges and served on the benches of the High and other Courts with the greatest distinction. For his part he should like to see them made district judges in larger numbers. Greek philosophers and sophists had been introduced into the House already, and a Greek poet had said that a man was a fool who did not know how much the half was better than the whole. He did not believe that he would have excluded from the application of that principle speeches upon the Indian question. He thanked the House for having listened to him so patiently, and trusted that when any question involving his constituency arose they would be equally indulgent with him, as the Welsh, Free Church, Liberal and larger half thereof, had for many years been inarticulate and unrepresented.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) rose to support the Amendment. Like the preceding speaker he had been an officer in the service of the Bengal Government, and he was extremely pleased to hear the way in which the people of that country had been referred to. A kindlier or a juster people did not exist, and, moreover, Bengal had the most numerous population of any state under the Crown of England—some 50,000,000 people. The better-class inhabitants were highly educated, and this country owed a great debt of gratitude to the Province, for during the 100 years in which Great Britain had been building up its power in India, Bengal had been the milch cow from which we had drawn our resources. We were therefore under an obligation to Bengal and should listen to the representations which it made. These representations appeared to have been made in a very constitutional form. There had been a protest which had rarely come from any country. He associated himself with the hon. Member for East Nottingham in his remark that the recent Government had shown hostility towards these people. That hostility began within three months of Lord Curzon's government. When the noble Lord came into power the rights of the Government in the municipality of Calcutta, were protected by twenty-five nominated members, while fifty were elected to represent the wealth, the commerce, and the intelligence of the town. This body had been doing its work well, and it was not till Lord Elgin's time that any question about it arose. Lord Elgin examined into the matter and came to the conclusion that that body was working well, though it was necessary to give more powers to the chairman. But Lord Curzon came in and destroyed the body and reduced the elected members from fifty to twenty-five, so that the popular representatives — merchants, capitalists, and landlords—were always in a minority. A Committee was appointed to examine into the question of rating, but it was a strange fact that not one of the twenty-five elected members were on that Committee. The system of education which had grown up was destroyed and the native members of the University were driven out. While the men of wealth were insulted, the men of education were wronged. The important point was that everybody outside of the Government was hostile to this measure. When the Lieutenant Governorship of Bengal became vacant there was one man for that appointment and that was the hon. Member for East Nottingham. He was, however, undesirable, because he found in Assam the coolies in the tea-gardens were not well used. He himself had had a great deal to do with the supervising of the enlistment of these coolies and knew they were not well treated. The hon. Member for East Nottingham drew attention to this fact and he was put aside. Another gentleman of great experience and ability, Sir James Bourdillon, was opposed to the partition; he was allowed to hold the appointment for a year and he was turned out and Sir Andrew Fraser put in. He had never been a single day in Bengal, and naturally found the task of governing that great province an extremely heavy one. His (Mr. O'Donnell's) knowledge of this question was derived from a twenty years' stay in Bengal. His last appointment was that of a commissioner of a division with 12,000,000 inhabitants, a division that had been taken from Bengal without any one being consulted. It seemed to him that the principal argument in this case was that of population. There could not be any argument more erroneous. The difficulty of the government of a country was not a question of population. It was more difficult to administer government to 1,000,000 Englishmen than to 50,000,000 Bengalese. Practically the whole population were docile peasants. Another point urged by the Government was that there had been such a great increase in the population. That also was incorrect. There had been four censuses taken, and he had carried out the third, and he had come to the conclusion that the increase of population was due to the better numeration of the people. But even so, such an argument was ridiculous. The population of England increased threefold during the last century, but nobody had ever heard of partitioning England up into different governments. There was a point to which he did not willingly refer, but it had been referred to by the hon. Member for East Nottingham, and that was that in his opinion this measure had been carried out, not for administrative, but for political reasons, the reason being to break up the power of Bengal and divide it into two. Perhaps Members of this side of the House did not often read the *Morning Post*, but a few weeks ago the correspondent of that newspaper, who was travelling with the Prince of Wales in India, took up this question of the partition of Bengal and wrote—

> "A study of the subject from that aspect forces upon me the conviction that it was rather a reply to that advocacy than for administrative reasons."

The advocacy referred to was that of the popular leaders. The correspondent went on to say—

> "The Government desired to strike a blow at intelligence and enterprise which had taken a form of which it did not approve."

He would take up the time of the House no longer than to say to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India that it was quite possible to do away with what had been done, and that he fully associated himself with the advice given by the hon. Member for East Nottingham in regard to the erection of

Behar and Chota Nagpur into a separate province.

*MR. T. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said he did not propose to detain the House at any length, but there were one or two aspects on which he desired to make some observations. He did not know much of Bengal, although he had been there and had friends there, but he could assure the House that what the hon. Member for East Nottingham had said as to the effect of this partition had not been an exaggeration. He knew that in the opinion of the natives this was a deep-laid plan on the part of Lord Curzon and the late Government to diminish the effect of the Government's previous attitude to the people of Bengal. He was not sure whether that was the case or not, or whether that Machiavellian policy was framed by the late Government, but he was rather of opinion it was as part of the wild policy that prompted the late Government to go in for such things as Chinese labour in South Africa and the Somaliland adventure without seeing the result which must accrue. But the result was the same. It was, he thought, unfortunate that a large and peaceful population should be struck at in this way. The Government had a right to do it, but they ought to remember what Burke said: that it was not a question of what it was our legal rights to do, but what it was to our interest to do. The other part of the Amendment raised rather a wider question than any hon. Member had dealt with that evening. People often spoke of the unchanging East, but he did not suppose that any country had changed more during the last thirty years than India. There was a new spirit, a new feeling there. We had a large population now trained by western education, which had been trained in western ideas, and it was absolutely impossible for us to go on refusing to give them an adequate share of the government of their own country. It was time that something was done. It was no exaggeration to say we were now living in the beginning of a great world-crisis. A new feeling had arisen over the whole of the East, a feeling which had attained its most extraordinary development in Japan, which would make the government of our dependency of India a very anxious matter for many years to come. There would be difficulties in the way, but if we adopted this new spirit, and imbued the administration of India with it, he did not see why our rule in India should not continue in undiminished splendour through the ages to come in the dim and distant future, and of which no man could see the end. But we had to recognise the new spirit, and if we did not, the circumstances would be such as we should hardly like to think of. It was a good thing in the opinion of many that the affairs of India were in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India. It had always been the curse of the administration of India that too much power had been placed in the hands of officials, and that they had been unable to respond to the aspirations of the people. It was a question that could rightly be dealt with now, and which ought to be taken up at once. We ought to associate the people more with the government of the country, and if we did, and based our government of that Empire on local self-government, he did not see why our government of India should not continue through the centuries.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said he had no intention of voting for this Amendment if it was pressed to a division, because he was perfectly confident that the Government, with a great opportunity before it and a long prospect of power in front of it, would do justice to Bengal and to India. At the same time he desired to associate himself with much that had been said by hon. Members who had just spoken. He deplored, in common with all well-wishers of India, the indecent haste and tortuous methods with which this measure of partition was hurried on; but not having lived in Bengal, he did not feel justified in giving an opinion one way or the other with regard to it. He deplored the unfortunate impression which had been undoubtedly created, not only in Bengal, but throughout India, that one object of the partition was to destroy and break up the national and political solidarity of Bengal. The House had heard the question of the partition discussed from both points of view. Both the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs and the hon. Member for East Nottingham evidently held briefs. The latter had asserted with some justification that he held a brief for the people of Bengal. He thought, however, that the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs was hardly justified in attacking the hon. Member for East Nottingham in the way he had done, because the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs belonged to a province which they were accustomed to call "Benighted," where opinions on the important subject under discussion were not likely to be illuminating or instructive. As regarded Bengal he (Mr. Smeaton) had little personal knowledge. His service had been rather in the northern north-western, and central parts, and in the far east of Burmah, so that he could claim a fair acquaintance with the feelings of the people of India as a whole. His object in rising was chiefly to say a few words upon the second part of the Amendment—

> "And we further beg to represent to Your Majesty that the reasonable demands of the Indian people for a larger share in the administration of their affairs should receive the consideration of the Government."

He had had very valuable opportunities of consulting many representative members of the best educated Indian people all over the continent, and he could say with a certain amount of confidence that the real object of the people of India, as represented by their leaders, was not so much to obtain offices under the Crown—those offices were showered upon them constantly. What they wanted was to get a hand in the control of the policy of India. Their point was—and it was a very vital one—that expenditure and taxation in India were excessive. Expenditure and taxation depended on policy, and therefore they claimed to have some share, subject, of course, to obvious limitations, in directing the policy of their country. It was a common remark, chiefly in the Tory Press, that it was a misnomer to speak of the "Indian people"—that the Indian people had never spoken collectively, and that the idea of anything like a body of Indian public opinion was absurd; that in fact "Indian public opinion" was a myth. That was a grave misapprehension. The people of India were very easily moved in the mass when aroused by any sentiment, anger, or affection. They must remember the extraordinary outburst of feeling all over India in thousands of villages when Her Majesty the late Queen was in danger of her life, the prayers that were offered in those villages, and then the deep grief that was exhibited all over the continent when her death was announced. He would point to another instance. The whole of India was aroused unitedly when this country sent its great contribution of relief during the great famine five years ago. He was himself a witness of the universal feeling of gratitude for that help. One more instance—of a sinister kind. In the dark days of the Indian mutiny, fifty years ago, when there were no railways or telegraph, the whole of northern India rose as if by a mysterious telepathy. It was nonsense to say that the Indian people had no collective views when they were moved, and he asserted that they were now moved, and that what they claimed they claimed through their leaders collectively. The one great grievance they felt was that whereas they were taxed beyond their taxable capacity they did not feel that they got value for the money they paid. They were over-governed. They did not believe the government was the system best suited to the condition of the country; and it was far too expensive. Although it seemed paradoxical, he had no hesitation in saying that there was no country under the sun more democratic than India. India had been over and over again conquered, but the villages never sacrificed their ancient democratic institutions, and no conquest ever suppressed them. He recalled a remarkable instance of this feature of the Indian people When he went to Agra at the request of the Governor to ascertain if the citizens would accept the octroi system of taxation, the people sent emissaries all over the surrounding districts, and their elected representatives afterwards met him and protested against the introduction of the octroi system, pointing out that it was a tax on imported goods which would raise prices, diminish consumption, and disorganise trade. The proposed system consequently had to be abandoned. They wanted Free Trade, and they got it. Another instance of the democratic disposition of the people was furnished in Burmah, immediately after the annexation. He recalled going up the Irrawaddy immediately after the annexation to endeavour to discover how they could establish peace within some fifty or sixty villages. He went to one village and asked that emissaries should be sent all over the country they represented to obtain an authority with whom he could deal. There instantly assembled a little Parliament of sixty or seventy, who elected a lady as their representative authority, and proceeded to discuss and arrange matters under her leadership, so that their democracy extended to women's suffrage. Was it to be wondered that the spirit of democracy had penetrated the villages, and had been enlarged into districts, which had extended into provinces, and then over the entire country? It seemed to him that the time had come for a Liberal Government to recognise these remarkable facts, and to endeavour not only to convince themselves, but the sceptical among the people of this country and this House, that a great national feeling and aspiration did really exist in India for a share in controlling the policy of the country, and thereby its taxation and expenditure, which they considered to be excessive. Therefore he respectfully suggested that the Government might send a Royal Commission to India to satisfy itself whether or not this national aspiration existed to the extent he had described; and, if it did, what system might be adopted to meet this aspiration; and whether there were not thousands of loyal, educated Indians capable of being employed as the elected representatives of the Indian people in a new form of government to correspond with those aspirations. It was of very happy augury that after seven years of pomp and pageantry, extravagance and misrule, there also had expired a Government which was represented by empty benches opposite, and that the Liberal Party should now be in a position to bestow on India the foundation principles of the Liberal policy—peace, retrenchment, and reform.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. JOHN MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): This Parliament presents a considerable number already of new features; and it is a new feature, and one, I think, on which we ought to congratulate ourselves, that this afternoon we have had six maiden speeches in succession from Gentlemen who have shown themselves possessors of a competent knowledge of Indian subjects and were eager to express the views which they represented. I, for one, have no quarrel with my hon. friend the mover of this Amendment. Though I am not one of those who desire that the House of Commons should be always interfering with the complex and difficult affairs of India, yet I think a debate of this kind can do nothing but good to this country and also to our interests in India. Upon the partition of Bengal I do not propose to detain the House very long. I wish very much for many reasons that my right hon. friend Mr. Brodrick was in the House, because he knows better that I can possibly know from the Papers what was in the minds of the India Office and what was also in the minds of the Indian Government of that day. So far as my information goes, I cannot assent to the views of those Gentlemen who have said that the movement for the partition of Bengal arose from political motives and from the desire to repress the expression of political opinion. Whether the original motives may not have taken on some colour of that kind I am not in a position to affirm or deny. But I think my hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham almost admitted that there was a case for the redistribution of the boundaries of the Province of Bengal in the amount of work laid upon the shoulders of the Governor of that province. My hon. friend quoted in another connection Lord George Hamilton, and I am sure we all extremely regret the absence of the noble Lord from our debates. Lord George Hamilton had a longer experience at the India Office as Secretary of State than I think anybody now living. Lord George in December last said that, so far as he could recollect, with scarcely an exception, he had never come into contact with a Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal who, when pressed, did not at once admit that the work he had to perform was almost an undue strain upon his strength. There was ample evidence that the labours of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal were enormous. That is not saying that the specific redistribution of the administration of Bengal was the wisest that could be devised. The hon. Member for East Nottingham produced his own scheme to-night, and one or two other Gentlemen have made suggestions. But this is not the moment for a technical examination of the precise way in which this redistribution of the administrative areas was carried out. It had been said that it would have been better if we sent as Governor-General some successful Gentleman from the House of Commons with a council, and some think that that would have been the best plan. Others, supported by the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, thought no more fortunate or happy system of government could be devised judging from the experience of the past. I do not say for a moment that I share that judgment, although I know that it was held and urged by Lord Curzon himself in the discussion of this subject. I take it, then, that some redistribution of areas was advisable. The word "partition" I am afraid is rather misleading, and we are apt to think of Poland and other nefarious transactions of that kind. I should be very sorry to admit that this was a partition in that sense. But it was, and remains, undoubtedly an administrative operation which went wholly and decisively against the wishes of most of the people concerned. It had been said, and unfortunately by an important person in India, that this demonstration of opposition in Bengal was "machine-made opinion," that it was the work of political wire-pullers and political agitators. I have often heard that kind of allegation made before. Governments are apt, when an inconvenient storm of public opinion arises, to lay it at the door of political wire-pullers and agitators. There are, however, Indian officials of great weight and authority who entirely put aside that allegation or insinuation, and who argue that these Calcutta agitators would have had no response from the people they were appealing to if there had not been in the minds of the people a distinct feeling that they were going to suffer a great wrong and inconvenience; and, although no doubt the agitators could form and disseminate these views, yet these sentiments and views existed quite independently of any wire-pulling or agitation. That is my own conclusion derived from reading the papers. But the redistribution of Bengal is now a settled fact, and every speech that has been made this afternoon has laid stress upon and given weight to that conclusion. At this moment there is a great subsidence—it may be only temporary—but there is a subsidence of the feeling against the redistribution; and in face of that it would be very unreasonable to ask the Government to start afresh to redistribute the areas and incur what, to my mind, would be a new outlay of taxation. As my hon. friend says, India has just had seven years of pomp and pageantry. The time has not yet come to pass any verdict upon the great administration of Lord Curzon. Some find the energy of it feverish; others find it glorious. At some future date the historian of that time will be able to pronounce much more effectively than we can what Lord Curzon's administration has effected and what not. But none of us will deny his fine powers, his great gifts, and his supreme devotion to what he believes to be the public interests. But my own view is that, at the end of his great period, India should now be allowed to take breath. Therefore, we should now move very slowly. I do not think it would be a desirable or even a defensible movement to attempt to reconstruct Bengal or to restore the old distribution of power in that area. My hon. friend who moved the Amendment suggested there should be an increase in the number of officers on the executive council, an increase in the Legislative Council, that there should be three natives added to the Council of the Secretary of State, and that there should be forthwith an advisory board set up in Calcutta.

Mr. John Morley.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: No, an advisory board should be set up, not in Calcutta, but in all the districts of India for purposes of consultation. My remarks had nothing to do with Calcutta.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I would point out that those advisory boards would have no responsibility, that all these other changes would need an Act of Parliament, and I doubt whether good results would follow. Whether the partition was a wise thing or not when it was begun, I am bound to say that nothing was ever worse done so far as disregard of the feeling and opinion of the people is concerned. It is a fundamental principle in any Government in which Englishmen and Scotsmen are concerned that you are bound to consult and take into consideration all the opinions and even the prejudices of those affected. When the scheme was in the first place exhibited to the people of India it was exhibited bit by bit. The first proposal was in one direction to take certain areas, and the second proposal was an extension and alteration of that. A final scheme in which all these competitive efforts were summed up was never submitted to the judgment of anybody in Bengal at all. The result of that was the raising of a storm by a plan which was never carried out, and the storm which had been raised raged with just as much violence when the final scheme came to be carried out. I think that is a matter which no defender of the late Government will really stand up for. Coming to the last and most important part, in some respects certainly the widest part of the Amendment, I do not think I need say much. I think I gather already that I need not at all assure hon. Gentlemen who represent Indian interests specially, and I need not assure the House, that so long as I have any responsibility for Indian affairs I shall not be likely to depart from those general principles of Liberalism—not in a Party sense, but in that sense in which both Parties, in my opinion, desire to see India governed. It seems to be sometimes forgotten that India has an ancient civilisation and that the people are not barbarians. The officials who have had most dealings with them admit, and not only admit but proclaim, that these people have in them admirable material upon which you may by and by—and in this case I do not at all object to the phrase "step by step"—build up a system under which they shall have a far greater share than they now have in the government. When this Amendment was first put on the Paper, it urged that the Government should take the admission of the natives of India to a larger share in the administration into their immediate consideration. The Viceroy has been on his throne I think three months, and I have occupied my office a few weeks with the trivial interlude of a contested election. For me, therefore, to guarantee the immediate taking of this matter into consideration would, I think, hardly be reasonable, and I am glad that the word has disappeared from the Amendment. But I for one shall deprecate in the case of anybody with whom I have any influence any resort to that rather harsh, rather arrogant, and rather supercilious language towards the people of Bengal which has been used by some from whom I should not have expected it. In the whole field of government there has been enormous activity and energy, no doubt, during the last six or seven years—in education, public works, irrigation, railways, and in regard to the frontier. I am not going into the frontier question now. It was once said that the study of the Apocalypse either found a man mad or made him mad. I sometimes think when I hear these endless discussions about the frontier—not by responsible men, but by irresponsible men—that the north-west frontier is almost as prejudicial a field of study in creating this state of mind as the Apocalypse has been said to be. My own view can be expressed in a few sentences. Though the zeal of your officers—most honourable for them—for great public works has sometimes gone to excess, so far as I am concerned there will be no tendency to stay vigorous action on the part of the Government of India in the direction of works which are proved to be, or which there is good reason to expect will be, of a remunerative character. If you want security and strength in India one of your ways of getting it is to lighten taxation, and I shall look therefore in the direction of greater economy in order to lighten taxation. I respond with all the conviction I have in me to the appeal for sympathy. You may call it sentiment if you like, but a man is ill fitted for the governing of other men if he does not give a large place to the operation of sentiment.

*EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I desire to express my concurrence with the general conclusions of the right hon. Gentleman. No one I believe wishes to impugn the good faith of my right hon. friend the late Secretary of State for India, or to assert that he intended to mislead the House when he promised to lay Papers. The right hon. Gentleman has accused the late Government of some precipitancy in sanctioning this scheme, but I think he hardly makes the charge good. The original scheme was put forward at least three years ago, and it was largely owing to the public criticism with which that scheme was met that it was modified in very important particulars. Then the right hon. Gentleman said he was not aware of the precise motives which actuated the late Government in assenting to this policy—whether their object was to combat political agitation in Bengal. So far as I know, the only object they had in view was to secure administrative efficiency. The wonder to me is that the change which the Government of India proposed has been deferred so long. It is fifty years since Lord Dalhousie described the burden resting on the Government of Bengal as greater than any single man could be expected to bear. Since then the population has risen from 40,000,000 to 80,000,000, and Calcutta in point of population has become the second city of the empire. The demands made on the time and energies of the local government have grown greater and greater every year with the increasing complexity of the problems connected with the rapid expansion of industry, and the development of municipal activity among a people whose proneness to litigation is, I think, only equalled by their aptitude for political controversy and criticism, and the keenness with which they scrutinise every detail of administration. I can hardly imagine a more conclusive proof of the need for this change than the fact that owing to press of business the Lieutenant-Governor is unable to visit many of the districts under his charge more than once in the whole five years of his tenure of office. It being admitted that some change was necessary, the late Government were confronted by the fact that only one alternative was possible to that recommended by the Viceroy, and that was the solution alluded to by some of the earlier speakers, namely, the adoption of the Presidency system in force in Bombay and Madras. There seem to be two conclusive reasons against the adoption of such an experiment. In the first place there is the great disparity of population in the three provinces. I speak from memory, but I think the population of Bombay is something like 20,000,000; Madras, 40,000,000, while the population of Bengal is at least double that amount. I doubt very much—it may be rash to say so—whether any one starting *de novo* with a *tabula rasa* would now devise the Presidency system as one ideally suited to the needs of Indian government. For what is that system? You send out a gentleman from England who has none of that initial or personal knowledge of the people over whom he is to rule, or of the problems he is expected to solve, which every Resident and Commissioner possesses. In order to correct that inevitable defect, you associate with him two members of the Civil Service whose nominal prestige is inferior, but whose practical control of affairs is as great as his own; you make the Governor in fact, a mere *primus inter pares* in a triumvirate, with the result that instead of the sympathetic influence of a personality you have to content yourselves with the intangible authority of a bureaucracy. Now, defective as that system is in the old Presidencies, its transference to the province of Bengal would have been attended with peculiar drawbacks. Owing to the fixity of the land system in Bengal the civil servants there are deprived of one of the readiest means of coming into daily contact with the lives and interests of the people. Whoever is appointed Governor of Bengal must have had previous experience of Indian administration, and his colleagues of the Civil Service would merely serve to divide his authority and weaken his sense of responsibility. There is one very pertinent question which may be put to gentlemen who criticise the change, and that is, "What individual or class would be benefited by the retention of the old system?" I can imagine only three. The members of the legal profession are naturally apprehensive that in course of time, with the development of the new Province, the local courts will absorb a great deal of the judicial business which now passes through the High Court at Calcutta. Then there is the class of absentee landowners, who prefer the social attractions of the capital to living on their own properties, but in future will have to spend a great deal of their time at their estate offices at Dacca; and, lastly, there is the class whose principal occupation is political agitation, and who will find much of their material for agitation cut away when they are no longer able to point to the neglect of local interests, which under the existing system is almost inevitable. One of the main reasons for this change is the crying need of the Province of Assam for the development of its material resources and an increased efficiency in its administration. Almost every large administrative area in India has its own Civil Service Commission trained on the spot and acquiring fresh knowledge every year of local conditions and requirements; but Assam has had for a long time past to borrow its Commission from Bengal, and has thereby lost the advantage elsewhere derived from length and continuity of service. If there is one principle of government which is elementary, it is that all administration is bad which depends on borrowed men. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment has added to it an expression of opinion that the time has come for associating the people of India in a larger measure with the management of their own affairs. That is rather a large subject to tack on as a rider to an Amendment to the Address. I suppose we all desire, whatever the form of government, not only to treat the feelings of the inhabitants with respect, but also, as time goes on and as they show themselves fit, to give them wider opportunities of expressing their opinions on questions that interest them. But even the mover of the Amendment recognised that the process of evolution must be a gradual one. Legislative Councils were not introduced until 1861, and thirty years elapsed before any provision was made for native representation upon them. I think it would be rash to take the experience of the last fourteen years as affording adequate justification for a further step in that direction. Considering the character of India and the fact that it is as large as the whole of Europe, excluding European Russia, it is surely obvious that the permanence of British rule depends to a large extent on preserving unity of method. A popular system cannot be applied to one part of India and withheld from another. Though I do not desire any harsh repression of the political aspirations of any section of the community, I think it is safe to say that a great many of the ideals put forward by orators at the Congress are not only wholly opposed to the views of the large majority of the creeds and races of India, but if translated into practice, would be quite unsuited to their practical needs and requirements There is no doubt that the present scheme has given rise to a great deal of discontent, and I agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy that there is no proposal, even at home, which is more certain to awaken bitterness and opposition than a proposal to alter old geographical limits, to redistribute electoral areas, or to interfere with municipal boundaries. But there is this to be said in favour of the scheme of administrative re-adjustment proposed by the Government of India, that, not only does it subserve the interests of administrative efficiency but it actually secures far better grouping than has hitherto existed both of language and nationality by recognising the preponderance of the Mahommedan element in the North, and amalgamating the Uriyah-speaking populations of the West. I will only observe in conclusion that the same agitation has been raised again and again in connection with similar administrative changes in other parts of India. We all remember the great outcry which arose with regard to the severance of the frontier provinces from the Punjaub, a policy the success of which I conceive is now almost universally recognised.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I think that there was no popular objection to that whatever; the objection there was a purely official one.

*EARL PERCY: It is very difficult to gauge how far an agitation does represent a real popular feeling or not. Personally I doubt not from former precedents that within a very short space of time—probably five or six years—those who are loudest in their denunciation of the present scheme will be foremost in their recognition and admiration of the courage with which Lord Curzon has faced a temporary unpopularity in the permanent interest of administrative efficiency.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said that, in view of the sympathetic statement of the right hon. Gentleman and the nature of the discussion, he would beg leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he rose to move the Amendment of which he had given notice dealing with the exclusion from this country of foreign contract labour during times of trade disputes. It would be within the recollection of those Members who were present in the last House of Commons that an Amendment very similar to that which he now brought forward was submitted by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, when it received great support in the House, the Opposition, he believed, supporting it unanimously. At all events, 148 Members supported it, including the present Home Secretary, his Under-Secretary, the Postmaster-General, and many distinguished members of the present Government. He hoped, therefore, that the principle of the Amendment which he proposed would find acceptance in the House, and that hon. Members on the opposite side would support the views which they then held. No doubt he should be reminded that he himself voted against that Amendment. He was quite prepared for that charge, but he hoped he should not be deemed guilty of any inconsistency in the matter, because his reason was that he was most anxious to do nothing whch would jeopardise the passing of the Aliens Act as a whole, and he had to subordinate what he believed to be the lesser to the greater consideration. He had to help the Government by every means in his power to pass that Bill into law, and he could not do anything which would risk the passing of that measure. In spite of that he was at that time and was now in complete agreement with the views of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and his friends. He said so at the time in the House, and he had not changed his opinion in a single particular. As, however, must often happen under a system of Party government, he had to waive his personal feelings in deference to those of the Leaders of the Party to which he belonged. He thought, moreover, he might safely prophesy that there were many hon. Gentlemen on the Benches opposite who, before this Parliament was over, would find themselves forced into the same position. As he understood the position of hon. Gentlemen opposite, it was that they had no strong objection, or indeed, any objection whatever, to the admission of any quantity of unskilled or skilled labour during ordinary times, but that they did object to the admission of such labour at times when labour disputes were taking place. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil the other night, he was glad to find, went a little further than that when he however, that the importation or the protested against the employment of an enormous number of foreign seamen on British ships. He heartily agreed with the hon. Member, and hoped that he and his friends would press that point forward. His view was, influx of cheap foreign labour, which from the circumstances of the case was willing and, indeed, often compelled, to work for hours and wages which no trade union would tolerate, must have an adverse effect upon the general standard of work and living of the employés, and place them at a disadvantage. There was no doubt that a large number of unskilled foreign labourers made a strike much less difficult to organise and much more likely to be conducted with success. On the Royal Commission they had evidence brought before them from the Lanarkshire coal mines, and the witnesses told them that foreign labour from Berlin and elsewhere had been systematically imported into that district because their labour was a little cheaper than the labour obtainable in the district. It seemed to him a wrong thing that these people should be placed in that position, and that the country should lose by emigration many valuable men. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, in putting forward his Amendment last year, spoke of men as having been vilely dismissed, and of a number of Spaniards and Poles having been introduced into the works, the English people being told that if they objected there would be a further importation of Spaniards and Poles. That threat was carried out, and there was abundant evidence that a large mass of this labour in Spain and Southern Italy was readily available. It had been imported into this country before, and might, and very likely would, be again on similar occasions in the future. He believed that at the time the labour problems of the Transvaal were being discussed and thought out, a large number of these men, Spaniards and Poles, were offered to mine owners at an incredibly low rate of wages—wages very little higher than those at present given to the Chinese. That fact was enough to show that the idea of employing European labour of this kind was not an illusory one—the question had been considered, and the labour was readily available. He supported the principle of this Amendment because he felt strongly that nothing could be more disadvantageous or, indeed, disastrous to this country than to lower generally the standard of living of the wage earners and working classes of this country. In the possibility of the importation of cheap foreign labour for the purpose of settling trade disputes to the disadvantage of one of the two parties to the dispute, he saw a menace to our prosperity and a very real and serious menace to the standard of comfort which the working classes possessed after so long and costly a struggle. They had the evidence, given before the Royal Commission, of a gentleman, who was admitted to be a good authority on this question, the Rev. Mr. Davis, Rector of Spitalfields. That gentleman described as typical, and not at all exceptional, the case of a man in the tailoring trade with a wife and three children whose earnings were 7s. a week. People of that kind could be imported at any time when there was a trade dispute, and such a thing would obviously mean disaster to our working classes. No cheapness to the consumer could compensate for the bad effect on the producer which the low wage standard of 7s. a week would bring about. On the grounds of national health, and of what had been described as the physical deterioration of the people, this question had to be dealt with. We had little to depend upon now in our great and unequal struggle with the industrial world except the general physical condition of our people, and he did not see how we were to retain that, or improve the position our people were now in, if at any time there was to be under cutting in the manner he had described. It might be said that the logical effect of the argument he put forward was that a national standard should be set up, and that all employers should be compelled to pay a certain rate of wage, independent of any competition from abroad; but he had never taken that attitude. It seemed to be an impossible one. An industrial struggle within the limits of any given country should be fought out by the citizens of that country, and the importation of foreign labour in order to settle a trade dispute to the disadvantage of one of the parties to the dispute should be regarded as a foul blow and ought not to be permitted. It was with the hope that legislation would be promoted to prevent that foul blow from being struck that he put forward the Amendment. He hoped that hon. Gentlemen opposite, however much they might question the merits of the Amendment, would not question the sincerity of his motives in moving it, and he did not think they would. He begged to move.

*SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith) said he wished to second the Amendment. Representing as he did a large working-class constituency, and also being one of the officials of the Alien Emigration Society which initiated the Bill to prevent undesirable aliens coming to this country, he desired that this logical consequence of that Act should pass into law. While trying to pass the Bill through Committee the Unionist Party were accused of bringing in the measure for window-dressing purposes, and of not being in earnest. He desired to show to-night at all events that they were in earnest and wished this matter to be carried through. He pointed out that in the United States the first Alien Immigration Act passed did not possess this charm, and that in a very short time it was found necessary to amend it.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question to add the words, 'But we humbly express our regret that Your Majesty's Speech contains no reference to the exclusion from this country of foreign contract labour during times of trades disputes.'"—(*Sir William Evans-Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The hon. and gallant Member certainly succeeded in dissembling his tone in regard to his proposal under two hostile votes delivered last July, as he assured us he had always been in favour of it, and that he only voted against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Keir Hardie) because he did not wish to wreck the Aliens Bill. I should like to ask the hon. Member whether, supposing the late Government still occupied these benches, he would move this Amendment to the Address and ask them to accept it.

SIR W. EVANS-GORDON: I certainly would do so, and I beg to remind the right hon. Gentleman that I moved an Amendment to the Address against my own side, which was the means of bringing to the front the Alien question. A Royal Commission was appointed on my Amendment to the Address of 1902.

* MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: As the hon. and gallant Member was prepared to vote against his own Government on the Amendment it is rather difficult to see why he did not propose it last year. It was a question of great interest; but I am not going into that at all. When the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil brought forward his Amendment in July, at both the Committee stage and the Report stage I voted in favour of the Amendment, and the Prime Minister also voted for it, as well as the great bulk of hon. Gentlemen who were then on the Opposition side of the House. There are, as we all know, arguments for and against this proposal. There was a considerable discussion on the point last July, and I cannot understand why the hon. and gallant Gentleman, when he had a chance of putting this principle into the Aliens' Bill, did not make use of that opportunity. He now comes forward and blames us, and proposes practically a vote of censure upon us for not putting this proposal into the King's Speech this session, when he knows perfectly well that legislation with regard to it is impossible—perfectly impossible, for the simple reason that we cannot do everything at once. We have been in office a very short time, and have had a general election since we were put in, and we are now about to deal with many important questions. It is too soon altogether to re-open the question of the Aliens Act, and the hon. Gentleman very well knows that it is out of our power at the present time to propose any such legislation as he suggests. The hon. and gallant Member did not vote for the proposal during the passage of the Aliens Bill, and he gave as his excuse that he did not wish to risk the passage of the Bill. I remember at that time it was said by the late Home Secretary that it was not germane to the Bill. Why was it not? The Bill dealt with various questions. The principle on which the right hon. Gentleman opposite acted was that the Bill should exclude undesirables, and many classes were excluded, such as diseased persons, lunatics, and the very poor. But why not exclude undesirable labour, if labour is undesirable? On what argument could the hon. Gentleman fairly exclude this question from the purview of that Bill? No; the hon. and gallant Member did not intend his Motion on this ground. I must remind the House of something more. For the last ten years right

hon. and Gentlemen on the other side of the House have declaimed, in season and out of season, on the importance of dealing thoroughly with this Aliens question. For nine years they neglected it, and in the tenth year they brought in a Bill which they pressed through the House, and on such slender foundation did they stand that the hon. Gentleman said it would have risked the passage of the measure if he had endeavoured to carry the Amendment of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. And now the hon. and gallant Gentleman proposes to censure us because we do not and cannot do what the Unionists refused to do last July when they had the chance. The House knows perfectly well that the Government cannot accept this Amendment, and I presume hon. Gentlemen opposite do not intend to press it to a division. It would be ungrateful after the support we gave to this principle. The hon. and gallant Gentleman knows well that the great majority on this side would support the Government in rejecting this Amendment, though most of us are in favour of the principle which underlies it. Is he then going to force us, knowing that, and having regard to the confession of his own exigencies last July, to vote against his Amendment? We cannot accept his Amendment at the present time, and as regards the future, I have no doubt it will come up for consideration on a more suitable occasion. I do not know whether the Aliens Act will come under the purview of this House, but it may be that amendment may have to be made in one direction or another, and if, and when, that opportunity arises, then will be an excellent opportunity for considering this question.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he was delighted that the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney should have thought fit to bring forward his proposal. It only showed what a sobering effect a general election had on the mind. He remembered that the everlasting cry of the hon. and gallant Member and his friends was to clean something off the slate, and they started wiping this off the slate immediately after putting it on. He wondered if the majority of the hon. and gallant Member's Party had been maintained the House would have heard a word on this question. It was very wonderful how people changed. He supposed that they might expect the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to vote for this Amendment. He did not want to say the right hon. Gentleman had changed his mind, but he remembered reading a speech of the right hon. Gentleman in which, in reply to a question as to why he did not vote for this particular Resolution, he said it was not germane to the Bill. As a matter of fact the Act was an absolute fraud, and he himself stated distinctly when it was before the House that it would not do anything to promote that for which the hon. Member was honoured. Unfortunately a record was kept of other utterances, and he remembered the hon. Member's asking whether they could prove that this Bill would be used as an instrument for introducing cheap labour, and he replied that he thought it would be so used. Around the East End the hon. Member declared that this Bill was going to stop sweating, get rid of slums, and stop rack-renting. He remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean voted against the Second Reading and took a few hon. Members with him into the lobby, with the result that some of the people who believed what the hon. Member for Stepney said waited for him (the hon. Member for Woolwich) on the railway platform and threatened him with a little personal violence. What a wonderful measure it had proved! All it had done was to provide a few soft jobs for people. A little deaf and dumb girl had been kept out last week under this wonderful Act. There was another case: to-day a refugee in danger had asked for the asylum of Britain, which had always stood for the right of asylum. It had been said that wherever the British flag was unfurled there was liberty. That used to be so, but it was altered by the late Government. The present Government had started cleaning the slate, but it would take a long time. Many hon. Members went down to their constituencies on the passing of this Act and laid in a stock of fireworks to celebrate the event, but those fireworks were wasted, because the people soon discovered that the time of the House had been wasted on a fraud of a Bill. The rich people could buy their way in, but they would not admit a man like Mazzini. He hoped the Opposition were proud of that state of things, but he was ashamed of it. When the measure was before the House an attempt was made by the Labour Members to prevent its being used as a means of procuring blacklegs to lower wages in this country, but they were defeated. The Act had not kept out a single alien who would have come into competition with labour here. Seven persons had been kept out, and five of them would have dropped down dead had they been allowed to come ashore. The late Member for King's Lynn asked how the examination would take place, and he was told that they would be examined in a building on shore. And then came the further question, "After that what then?" and the answer was, "They would not allow them to land." It wanted a very clever Government to do a thing like that. He did not think the present Government could equal that in any circumstances. The people who promoted Bills ought to know their real effect. The position of the Labour Members was that some of the Members of this House had decided to bring in a Bill on this matter, and they expected it to pass as an unopposed measure. Surely there would not be found an hon. Member on the Opposition benches who would oppose it after what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said at question time, and he expected the hon. Member for Stepney and hon. Members opposite who voted with him on this particular question in the last Parliament would vote solidly in favour of the Bill which was about to be introduced. The Act wanted amending in a variety of ways, and at the proper time he should urge the Home Secretary to consider the way in which poor people at the present time were compelled to live. These aliens were brought in by an association from countries where they gave too much protection to the rich and not enough to the poor. They could not catch old sparrows with chaff like that. That was a question which had to be grappled with. Dwellings in some districts became more and more crowded, and the more they were crowded the more they were rack rented. In Spitalfields he had known poor people living in coal cellars at 1½d. per night. He held it should be a criminal offence on the part of the sanitary authorities not to put a stop to that. Would the members of the late Government and their supporters join in assisting to put down the system of sweating? The last Government gave out contracts for cap making for the Navy at prices which it would not pay any decent woman to work for. There was a system of contracting and sub-contracting and sub-contracting again which should be stopped. But the people who did that class of work were not on the register, and he supposed they were not worth considering or worrying about. It was idle to make excuses for not safeguarding the interests of the workmen of Stepney in last year's Act. They knew now that the Act was a mere makeshift for killing time. He and his friends said so at the time. His description for what was done last year was that the whole of the British people were bluffed by the Government doing nothing at all. Week after week they sat on these benches praying and beseeching the Government to do something for the people, and pointing out to them that the greatness of the Empire did not——

*MR. SPEAKER: A review of last session is hardly relevant to this Amendment.

MR. CROOKS: I am obliged for the correction, but we are really discussing a Bill of last year. I stand rebuked.

*MR. SPEAKER: I said "a review of last session."

MR. CROOKS: Thank you, Sir. I think last session's proceedings have been very properly dealt with by the electors of this country and I will not go into them. As lovers of the poor he and his friends had sympathy with the Amendment, but they were not going to vote for it. They were going to introduce a Bill which would, he hoped, make the law on this matter what they desired, They would vote against this Amendment, and they were willing to go into every constituency in the country and state their reason for doing so. He was perfectly sure that the industrial community would be with them on that occasion. Some of the points with which they wished the Home Secretary to deal were sweating, overcrowding, and rents—if that could possibly be done by the introduction of a Fair Rent Bill. He appealed to the hon. Member to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): The hon. Member for Woolwich has made the important statement that it is the intention of himself and his colleagues to bring in a Bill dealing with this subject, and that being the case I certainly do not see that my hon. friend need press his Amendment. We shall be able to say what we have to say when the hon. Member brings in his Bill. The reason why I personally am anxious that this matter should be discussed and why I would be glad to see the Bill is that it seems to me by itself to indicate a perfectly illogical proceeding. It appears to me and has always appeared to me to be perfectly illogical and inconsistent to prohibit the immigration of these alien labourers and at the same time to allow the free import of alien goods. The hon. Member has said that during last session he sat praying and beseeching the Government which then sat on the Treasury Bench to do something for the people and that nothing was done. Now he has his opportunity. Let him pray and beseech a Government more powerful than the last, and by the time the next general election comes round let us see what account he will give of its answer to his prayers.

Sir W. EVANS-GORDON said that in deference to the request made by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and in view of the fact that a Bill was to be introduced by the hon. Member for Woolwich and his friends, he begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

EROSION OF THE COASTS.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) rose to move an Amendment representing to His Majesty that the serious encroachments of the sea on our coasts call for the immediate attention of the Govermment.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question (19th February), "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON said when the House rose he had just commenced to move the Amendment standing in his name dealing with the encroachments of the sea. It was a question of the utmost importance, as the sea was encroaching on the coast in many parts of the United Kingdom at an alarming rate. In Holderness it was a very serious and grave question. From the seaside town of Bridlington to as far as Spurn Head the sea had swept away the land at a very rapid rate; as much as four yards of land were swept away last year. He did not raise this as a party question, but he spoke on behalf of many parts of the United Kingdom and was glad to say that he had the support of many Members situated on the opposite benches. They wished to induce the Government to come to their assistance and to give financial assistance if possible. The law of the land and modern decisions in Courts of Justice were both on their side, going to show that it was obligatory on the Crown to prevent inroads being made upon the land by the sea. The Board of Trade returns showed that the acreage of the country was gradually diminishing; every year we lost a tract of land the size of Gibraltar. In thirty-three years, from 1867 to 1900, the acreage showed a diminution of over 182,000 acres, although the land reclaimed from the sea was included. He could not help thinking the present system was an unfair one. All the land reclaimed became Crown property, but, whilst receiving any revenue derived from it, it did nothing itself for the protection of our coast. In his constituency they had an excellent example. A very large tract of land had there been reclaimed from the estuary of the Humber, known by the name of Sunk Island, and it brought in to the Crown a revenue of something like £10,000 per year. They thought that a portion of this sum ought to be expended in defending the east coast from the ravages of the North Sea. Whilst speaking on the subject he wished to give grave warning to the President of the Board of Trade. It was absolutely necessary to maintain the road leading to Spurn Lighthouse, which was joined to the land by an embankment three or four miles in length. That embankment had to be maintained by the Board of Trade, but the Board of Trade defences were at the present time in a very bad position. The sea was likely to break through the main road, and he could assure the President of the Board of Trade that a very large sum would have to be spent in repairing the damage. There was an old saying that a "stitch in time saves nine," and he thought it would be well if the President of the Board of Trade looked into the state of the defences. If he did he would find them in a shocking condition. In Italy the State shared with the people of the district the cost of sea defence. In Belgium the State had built large sea defences entirely at its own cost, and had in many other cases contributed large sums towards the maintenance of the sea defences, the national grant in that country between 1902 and 1904 being no less than £1,000,000 per annum. In France also the State contributed large sums. At present in this country the cost of protecting our shores from the sea fell upon the individual landowner or upon the parish or township where the inroad might be taking place. The result had been entirely unsatisfactory, local effort to cope with the difficulty having absolutely failed. It was not for him to offer suggestions for schemes, and he did not know whether the President of the Board of Trade had any scheme for dealing with the matter; it would be best for the right hon. gentleman to discuss the subject with experts. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman would have seen the reports of the important Conference which took place in London on February 6th. Those reports showed conclusively that this was a national matter, which ought to receive national assistance. The difficulty was to persuade the nation to give assistance. He had not raised the question in any Party spirit or with any idea of personal advantage, because land in which he was interested had no connection whatever with this matter. He trusted that the President of the Board of Trade in his reply would be able to hold out a hope that it was the intention of the Government to do something. Perhaps he might be able to see his way to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter, to see what damage was done, and to report as to the best method of effectually dealing with it. It had been said that the Government intended to find work for the unemployed, and he could not imagine a better or a more beneficial mode than that they should be put to the task of defending our foreshore. He maintained that it was the duty of the Crown to protect our shores from attacks from the sea just as much as it was their duty to protect them from attacks by enemies. He thanked the House for listening to him, and begged to move.

*MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) seconded the Amendment. He declared that the question had become a national one, and he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would make some official inquiry into it. The matter was one which required their earnest attention. A great many of the local authorities had done much in order to protect our coasts from the erosion of the sea, expending large sums of money in that direction. The town of Bridlington had spent no less than £100,000 in order to protect the town from the inroads of the sea, and this had placed an enormous burden upon the local ratepayers. In this respect he would appeal to the President of the Board of Trade as to the period allowed for the repayment of loans raised for the erection of sea walls and sea defences. He considered that where the defences were of a permanent character a longer period for repayment should be allowed local authorities than the scale which existed at present? This was a serious question to those who were trying to do their best to stop the inroads of the sea, and he certainly thought something might be done to encourage local authorities by making better provision for the repayment of loans than was allowed them by the present short terms. Bridlington some thirty years ago obtained a loan, and the period for repayment allowed was fifty years; but seven or eight years ago they applied for a loan for works which were of a permanent character and they only obtained a period of twenty-five years. That was a very short period for works of a permanent character. He earnestly trusted that the President of the Board of Trade would seriously consider the matter. It was one which affected the country as a whole, and it particularly affected the ratepayers along our sea coast. It ought to be attended to, and he trusted that some official inquiry by experts would be made. He hoped local authorities would not only be assisted by the Government by advice and in a pecuniary sense, but that the Government would do something to place the matter upon a national basis so that all the local authorities might know their position.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the serious encroachments of the sea on our coast call for the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government.'"—(*Mr. Stanley Wilson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said that as he represented a constituency which was one of the chief sufferers from the great and growing evil of sea erosion, and one of the chief victims of the ever-recurring expense which that evil entailed, he ventured to address a few words to the House. He recognised that it would be wholly unreasonable to expect that this question, so long neglected by so many Governments, should have found a place in the programme of the present Government, in these days of its tenderest youth, not to say its toddling infancy. They must all recognise that the Government had a large, varied, and ambitious programme, and if the question raised by the Amendment had involved any consideration of legislation he would have had some hesitation in rising to support it; but he ventured to suggest that this was not necessarily a question of legislation. It was, it seemed to him, rather a question of sympathetic administration, and he looked with some confidence to the President of the Board of Trade to give it that sympathetic consideration, first of all because he knew the broad mind with which the right hon. Gentleman approached all matters of public interest, and secondly, because he remembered that, according to the proverb, new brooms swept clean. The operations of nature were responsible in a large measure for the erosion of our coasts, but a great deal of that erosion was due to the defective methods which had been employed to deal with the evil. A large portion of the land which had been allowed to be washed away by the sea had been so washed away through the ignorance or negligence of the owners of the land. Another trouble was that the local or other authorities had been in the habit of employing their own officer to design and carry out the defence works; and in many cases the men so employed had no practical knowledge of the subject. He could instance experiences at Lowestoft and Morecambe Bay. It was here and in this direction that he suggested that the Government could be helpful. He was not going so far as to suggest that the cost of maintaining our coasts from the invasion of the sea should fall entirely on the National Exchequer. He would like it. All who represented sea-board constituencies would like it. But he fully recognised that as things were at present and as things were likely to be for some time to come that demand could not be granted. But there were things the Government might do. The Government might assist to provide the funds for the necessary defensive works, at low interest, on easy terms of repayment, secured, in the case of private owners, on the land, and in the case of municipal owners, on the rates of the local area, and subject always to the condition that the works should in every case be carried out by an engineer of experience in this work and approved by Government. Such a course as that would ensure some organised method in the treatment of the evil of which they complained, and, he felt confident, proper and permanent work. So far as he was concerned, speaking on behalf of the local authorities in his own constituency, whilst they would like to ask for all they wanted, they thought it prudent and discreet to ask for what they thought they might reasonably hope to get, namely, some action on the part of the Government recognising the necessity for uniformity in coast defence work, and for the direction of those works by some one of competent authority and of competent experience. If those things were forthcoming, and if, combined with them were offers of reasonable terms on which to raise the funds required for the works and reasonable periods within which to repay the advances made, whilst they would not have removed the evil—which unfortunately was not removable—they would at any rate have mitigated in some considerable measure the burden which at present weighed heavily and with increasing oppressiveness on some of the most important districts of the country.

Mr. G. BARING (Isle of Wight) drew attention to a very important conference held in London a short time ago of the representatives of local authorities of many places on the coast, which came to the unanimous decision that it was time the Government intervened and took some strong action in order to come to the assistance of local authorities in the matter of sea defences. There were most alarming reports of the disastrous action of the sea on the east coast, and the conference was unanimously of opinion that the financial cost entailed was far too great to be borne by the local authorities. At the town of Sandown they complained that the action of the sea was assisted by the action of the War Office, which had been carting away tons and tons of the foreshore for the purpose of constructing some forts in the neighbourhood: that had had the effect of greatly weakening the sea defences. Only a short time ago the sea washed away a large part of the road in that locality, and nearly separated the town and foreshore from the other part of the island. Then there was a disaster at Freshwater, where the patriotic ratepayers had raised the funds necessary to repair the sea defences. But matters of this kind could not be left to private individuals or parish authorities. The Isle of Wight authority to deal with this question was the rural district council. That was a comparatively poor body; the rateable value was low, and it was quite impossible for them to deal with this question. He ventured to suggest that it would be possible for a systematic inspection to be made of the coast line, and a schedule might be prepared showing where the sea was doing most damage and where immediate assistance ought to be given. He quite recognised that for the past ten years there had been very little money for this or any other work, but he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would see that it was a matter to be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. He was certain of a sympathetic reply, but he submitted that the House was entitled to more than that. The sea was active, and it was necessary that something should be done at the earliest possible moment. If his suggestion were acted upon and the report sent to the right hon. Gentleman he was sure that the President of the Board of Trade would see the necessity of something being done immediately.

MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby) said he made no apology for adding a few words on this important question. The constituency he represented had perhaps the longest coastline in England, and he would scarcely be performing his duty to the inhabitants of that district if he did not support the Amendment. In the case of waste land and agricultural land the damage was serious enough, and he was fully aware of the enormous cost which would be entailed by a proper system of sea defence in such cases. That cost had been estimated by eminent authorities to reach no less a figure than £25,000 per mile. In addition to that a charge at the lowest estimate of 10 per cent. on that amount would be necessary to provide for interest on the borrowed money and the cost of up-keep. But there was a far more serious side to this question. He spoke now of the case of numerous small fishing villages, whose houses were being gradually swept away and whose inhabitants were poor men who had a hard struggle to live. These men had to fight the sea to earn their daily bread and to contend with the same element in order to prevent their very dwellings from being engulfed. Fashionable watering-places had many rich visitors in their seasons who contributed to the funds subscribed by local effort for defraying the cost of sea defence; but it was a very different thing in the case of small fishing villages where the rate assessment added little to the local revenue, and where such defence as they could make against the encroachments of the sea had to come out of private pockets. He knew of one small village which had spent £5,000, provided by private persons, during the past twelve years in sea defence. He supported the idea that urban and district councils should be assisted to borrow money on easier terms for providing against sea encroachments. At present where the district councils took any steps in the matter they had to petition the Local Government Board for sanction to borrow money. Then the Local Government Board sent down an inspector to report. If the inspector reported favourably the council had to go into the open market and borrow the money on the best terms they could obtain for ten or fifteen years. That term was too short, and the burdens were too heavy. In the case of other public works the Public Works Loans Commission advanced the money at a rate not exceeding 3½ per cent. and the term for repayment ran up to fifty years. The Local Government Board should take into consideration whether they could not make arrangements to enable urban and district councils to borrow money on the same conditions. He wished to emphasise what had fallen from the hon. Member who moved the Amendment. He had no desire to make this a Party question. He admitted its difficulty, and, although the cost might be high, that was rather an additional reason for inducing the Government to find a proper solution of the problem. His Majesty's Ministers had announced their intention of providing the cost of repatriating the Chinese who had not left their homes unwillingly. Surely it was not too much to ask them to do something for those Englishmen who did not desire to leave their homes, but whose homes showed an undesirable tendency to leave them.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said he had to thank the hon. Member for Holderness for having brought this very important matter before the Government. The seconder of the Amendment had spoken about permanent defensive works having been erected on various parts of our coasts. They had, unfortunately, not been permanent. The truth was that many of those works had been badly engineered, and almost invited the sea to knock them down. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment that one of the most important subjects to be considered by the House would be the question of finding employment for those unfortunate people who could not find it for themselves; and he imagined that Parliament could engage in no better work than in organising employment to make good the erosion of our sea coasts. He noticed that Lord Rayleigh had made a proposal to build up defences against sea encroachments on the Essex coast, which he was glad to see the Central Body for the unemployed in London had accepted. He represented a seaboard constituency where funds had been provided by private subscription for defence against sea erosion, because all the money which could be raised by the rates had to be devoted to harbour construction and other purposes. He did not ask the Government to give money for sea defence, but he hoped they would endeavour with the aid of the Local Government Board so to organise the Central Relief Fund which had been subscribed for the unemployed that it might be utilised for works to provide against sea encroachments. He believed if that were done, and if the local authorities were allowed to raise money on such terms as had been already advocated, a work of great utility would be accomplished.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somerset, Wellington) said that this was a question which deeply affected his constituency. The whole of the northern boundary was washed by the Bristol Channel with a 34-foot rise of tide, and exposed to westerly gales and heavy seas. He perfectly agreed that these sometimes prevented Welshmen from coming over to endeavour to alienate his supporters, but he would rather fight their opinions than fight against the sea. The coast line in his division was composed partly of crumbling cliff, but the real defence against sea encroachment was the shingle. That shingle was always moving from west to east, although they were able to keep it up by means of groins. Some of the owners of the foreshore, however, allowed the shingle to be carried over to Wales, as had been done near Bridgwater. He believed that the Board of Trade could, on application, prevent the removal of the shingle. He knew that in the case of his own property he was successful in preventing it. The question was whether district councils could apply to the Board of Trade to grant a prohibition order to the foreshores of a district council lying further to the west over which they themselves had no jurisdiction. The prohibition should be extended to the whole line of coast in danger by sea encroachment. He asked the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade whether he would consider the question of appointing a small departmental committee to consider the whole matter, to take expert advice, and, having got that advice, would he on the application of any recognised local authority, be it county council or district council, send down an official of the Board of Trade to make inquiry and deal with particular local divisions. It might be said that what was a most excellent plan of sea defence in one case was useless in another, and that was why so much money had been lost along the coast. If the House could have some assurance, such as had been suggested, from the President of the Board of Trade, they would be grateful to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne) said he hoped on rising for the first time to address the House to receive its kindly forbearance. He asked this for two reasons; first, because he did not intend to inflict upon the House a lengthy speech, and second, because he was speaking in the interests of his constituents, to whom this was a matter of great importance. He should like to emphasize all that had been said by his hon. friend the Member for Holderness, and to back up the speech of the Member for Isle of Wight. He submitted that this was a question of as much importance to those who lived inland as to those who lived by the sea shore. Therefore, it was a national matter, and he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give money for the erection of sea defences, so that the whole expense should not be thrown on the local bodies.

*MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he wished to give a few facts to show the ravages which had been made by the sea in his own district. During the past ten years the sea cliffs had vanished to the extent of between twenty and thirty feet, and the beach had been lowered to the extent of ten feet, so that the sewers had been injured by the inrush of the sea, involving repairs which had cost considerable sums of money. Groins had been put up, and a seawall built, but during the past four years these had been seriously damaged, and further sums of money would have to be spent upon them. On the south side of the town which he represented there was formerly a splendid stretch of sand where the inhabitants used to enjoy themselves, but that had gone. He would not urge that the money of the country should be expended for the purpose of preserving the land of private landowners from sea encroachment. Far from it; but there was a duty on the Government to prevent some of the things which had already been indicated. The lowering of the beach had been brought about by the taking away of sand and stone for building purposes. These materials had been removed because the Government had permitted the landowners to have a particular right to the beach. If the Government could not recall the concessions already made, he trusted that they would not renew the permission to carry away sand, shingle and stones, from the foreshores, a permission which had been availed of in some cases to the extent of 500 tons per week. As to the unemployed problem, that was a question which must receive immediate attention. Numbers of men who were unemployed to-day might be employed on this work by the Government, and it would be a benefit to the nation before many years had passed away.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon District): I agree that this is a question of importance and urgency. I also agree with my hon. friend opposite that this is not a Party question, but then hon. Members opposite never raised it when they were in office. There is no doubt that some districts have suffered very considerably from the encroachments of the sea, although in other parts the sea is retiring from the old coast line. Unquestionably, coast defence is one of the most important subjects for the consideration of any Government. One town in my own constituency has suffered very severely. It is very difficult for a locality with a small population and low rateable value to protect the coast properly without increasing the burdens of the ratepayers beyond an extent which can be borne. Therefore, I think this is a question of national interest. The right hon Baronet has asked for protection from the political currents that flowed into his district from the direction of Wales. I think the right hon. Gentleman has shown that he is well able to protect himself. There remains the question of the removal of sand and shingle which left the land unprotected at Bridgewater and elsewhere. I promise to look into that matter. In fact, the policy of the Board of Trade in recent years has been to refuse permits to individuals to remove sand and shingle from the shore. When the House comes to consider on a large scale this matter of protecting our coasts it resolves itself, as nearly all questions do, into a question of money. Suggestions have come from all parts of the House to subsidise local authorities from the Imperial Exchequer in regard to this and many other matters. But this Government, as the hon. Member for Thanet has said, is in its infancy or still in its swaddling clothes, and their money-box is not very full at this moment. We have not the money to spend on all those schemes on which we would like to spend money. I would remind hon. Members that the Government has been asked to repeal the coal tax. Next, to throw the whole burden of education upon the taxes—which would mean a trifle of about £7,000,000. Then someone has suggested old age pensions. That is only another £26,000,000. Other suggestions are that light dues and high roads should be put on the taxes. This runs up to just a trifling sum of £50,000,000. These things show how difficult the problem is. Nevertheless, the Government recognise the importance of this matter, and they agree that the case is one for inquiry. A good many suggestions—some valuable suggestions—as to inquiry, inspection, and the employment of engineers of experience have been thrown out in the course of debate. These suggestions ought to be inquired into. The Government have decided to have an inquiry in the form of a Royal Commission, which will extend not merely to coast defence, but to two or three other kindred subjects—such as waste lands and probably afforestation. The Government recognise the urgency of these questions and propose to appoint a Commission at an early date to inquire into the matter. I do not think anything is to be gained by very hasty action. After all, the sea has been at work for a good many centuries, and I do not think it will act in such a way as to render precipitate action necessary. It is not for the purpose of putting off action that I make this proposal, but rather that we may devise what action shall be taken.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): I do not think we can complain of the tone which has been taken by the President of the Board of Trade. I represent a constituency which has a large seaboard. At St. Margaret's Bay the local authority has requested the Local Government Board to advance money in order to protect the bay from the ravages of the sea, and they have also subscribed liberally of their own money. In a matter of this sort I think some greater liberality might be shown than is now shown with regard to the length of time during which loans are repayable. I associate myself with the request that the Board of Trade should send competent engineers to advise localities. The right hon. Gentleman said that the matter resolved itself into a question of money. I think this question of the defence of the sea coast might receive a little more attention than many of the other claims put forward. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that he is going to grant an inquiry into the subject, but I hope he will not associate too many subjects, and that the first consideration will be given to this question of the erosion of the coast. I think we have got as much as we are likely to get from the Government considering the difficulties of the case, and I think my hon. friend might be satisfied with the assurance he has received, that the subject will be dealt with by inquiry without delay.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): Before the Amendment is withdrawn I should like to address one or two observations to the House from the point of view of the Department for which I happen to be responsible in this House. All I can say is that so far as the facilitation of public inquiry is concerned, the Local Government Board will do its best in that direction. The question of long or short periods for the repayment of loans is a very serious one, and one the Department would have to go into very carefully. I have nothing to add to what my right hon. friend has said, except that, so far as my Department is concerned, it will render the Board of Trade the sympathetic co-operation which such an important subject demands.

Mr. McVEIGH (Donegal, E.) said that with regard to private rights in foreshores he had known of many cases in which rights had been conferred upon individuals. Lord Annesley had for many years past to his knowledge been selling sand at 6d. a load from a foreshore with which he was acquainted, and the Crown actually proceeded to make an arrangement with Lord Annesley giving him rights in that foreshore. He had however got a clause inserted in the Act which prevented Lord Annesley from removing sand except at one point. He thought the Commission ought to have power to investigate the whole matter of the Board of Trade giving private property in foreshores to individuals. The second point he wished to put was whether the Commission would apply to Ireland which he urged it should do.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said that after the sympathetic reply of the right hon. Gentleman he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) rose to move an Amendment expressing regret that no remedy had been proposed to prevent the great want of employment which now existed. Speaking for a constituency which had many rich, but many more poor of the working class within its boundaries, he felt he would betray those who sent him to the House of Commons unless he entered a protest against the unruffled optimism of His Majesty's Government in regard to the trade of the country. We were told in the gracious Speech to congratulate ourselves upon the increase of our exports and imports as indicating the sound and progressive condition of our industrial position. But it was somewhat remarkable that while the gracious Speech recorded the fact that there had been an increase of our exports and imports, not a syllable had fallen in this House or elsewhere from the Government to show sympathy with or any intention to remove, the anxieties and misery from which the unemployed suffered. On the contrary, any executive act of the present Administration had been rather directed to a different purpose. In the Return compiled by the President of the Local Government Board one could see only one intention and that was to alienate sympathy from the unemployed and avert executive action. If that statement was thought to be too strong, he was quite prepared to water it down so as to describe the Return as designed to create the impression that pauperism and unemployment were not so bad as some people thought. It was not his business to defend the Return, but what it showed was that the cost of the pauper was greater now than it was in 1849. It showed also that the number of outdoor paupers had actually and comparatively declined since 1849. But anybody who had the slightest acquaintance with the Poor Law system inaugurated sixty years ago could have guessed that fact. The Returns of unemployment, such as they were, were sufficient for his case, and he would quote from those statements the steady increase of adult able-bodied indoor paupers from ·8 per thousand in 1874 to 1·1 per thousand in 1900 and 1·3 per thousand in 1905. Outdoor relief (able-bodied) had dropped from 11·7 per thousand in 1849 to 2·1 per thousand in 1905. Anybody, however, who had given any attention to the question knew that the system which in 1849 was slowly getting to work was bound to reduce the outdoor class. That was its great principle. The figures proved that persons who in 1849 were considered suitable for relief were not now considered suitable. What was the condition of these persons to-day? The figures provided no evidence that these persons were flourishing citizens. It was notorious that for some years past the vagrant class had been increasing. In short, the Return amounted to a declaration that after sixty years of free imports, cheap food, big loaves, trade union wages, temperance movements and reform, we were as we were in the matter of genuine poverty among the able-bodied. Indeed, we were probably worse, seeing that the 1·3 of able-bodied indoor paupers per thousand in 1905 was the outcome of a more rigorous system than the 1·5 per thousand of 1849. He denied that the figures as to imports and exports indicated that our industries were in a sound and progressive condition. Taking Trade Union figures, the statistics of the Statutory Unemployment Committees, and the results of independent researches into the social condition of the people, they showed that the state of our trade was far from satisfactory. Our foreign trade, they were told, had shown an increase. But had the wages of our workmen increased in proportion? That was the real test, not what profit the trader got, but what wages the British workman got, and how many workmen got no wages at all. The Board of Trade *Labour Gazette* proved that one out of every twenty trade unionists could not find work in England or Scotland; and if that was so, what must be the condition of unskilled and unorganised labour, and this was what the Government called a sound and satisfactory state of things! There was, in connection with this subject, a useful, but much-derided, Act of Parliament—the Unemployed Act. At least it enabled us to form some estimate of unemployment, though any estimate so formed must fall short of the truth. According to the Board of Trade Labour Gazette, taking London alone, 42,093 persons had been registered as unemployed in the London area. Of these, 8,072 had been given employment-relief at wages barely sufficient to keep body and soul together. What had become of the other 34,000, who had not obtained employment relief? They had been left to starve or were forced into pauperism. In the year in which they were told to congratulate themselves upon the exceptional prosperity of British trade some 34,000 persons most of them willing wage-earners, not wastrels or ne'er-do-wells, were left to starve or go into the workhouses. Whilst there was no suggestion of a remedy for this evil from the Ministerial side of the House, at least they on the

Opposition side could claim to have a definite remedy. Unionists believed that a defensive tariff would enormously mitigate the evils of unemployment. Hon. Gentlemen opposite denounced tariff reform, but he believed he would live to see a repetition of what occurred in the first half of last century in regard to the Corn Laws, and that those who now opposed fiscal reform would be the very men to bring it in. There was another Party on the benches near him, the Labour Party, which had a remedy. It was simple and drastic—the re-adjustment of the relations between Labour and Capital. He believed that Unionists and those of the Labour Party would come to recognise that the policies of tariff reform and social reform were closely related—were, indeed, the counterpart of each other, and that what was wanted was more regulation of our foreign and home trade. That must make social reform and fiscal reform go hand in hand. They would get no remedy for the unemployed problem unless it was approached in the right spirit. He believed the President of the Local Government Board and his colleagues would never solve the problem so long as they gazed complacently at Blue books while the people perished, and offered figures and Returns to starving men. The Government did not even handle their own figures properly. They imagined that the increase of imports and the increase of exports according to recent Returns showed an equally satisfactory position. The most significant feature of these trade Returns was that the imports exceeded the exports. Manufactured imports meant less work for the British workman. The excess of imports over exports meant a dead loss to the workmen of this country. The Free Traders declared that the excess of imports represented interest on our foreign investments abroad. Yes, while the rich man derived his profit from abroad, the poor man was unemployed at home.

MR. CROOKS: Let the rich man share it then.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said he would give the opinion of a writer who he thought would meet with respect. A Socialist writer, Mr. R. B. Suthers, in last week's *Clarion* said—

> "If the capitalists invest abroad, their capital will find employment for the foreigner, (or the colonist), and the interest on the investments comes home in the form of goods and may throw British workmen out of employment."

That was why they said a defensive tariff would enormously mitigate the evils of unemployment. The Government, they knew, would not regard a defensive tariff as a solution of the unemployed problem or as conducing to the general improvement of our trade; on the contrary, they thought our present trade system was perfect. What was the Government's alternative remedy to remove the evils of unemployment? Were they prepared to follow the lines laid down by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil? He saw no indication of it. The only crumb that could be gathered from the Government was in the last paragraph of the Speech from the Throne in a suggested amendment of the Unemployed Act. Those who were in the last Parliament knew that the rank and file, as well as the leaders of the then Opposition described that measure as a mere tinkering with a great subject. If an Amendment, poked away in the general list of measures which might or might not be dealt with, was their solution of the unemployed problem, then the House could form an accurate measure of the Government's sympathy with the unemployed struggling poor of this country. But there might be some promise in the record of the President of the Local Government Board. On examining that record he was bound to say that it was far from re-assuring. [Laughter.] That laughter showed that the memory of the House, as of the public, was short. When the right hon. Gentleman was one of the Unemployed Committee of 1893 he opposed the proposal of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil that Government grants should be given to local authorities for relief works, the right hon. Gentleman then declaring that "such a policy would debauch workers for a generation." On the same Committee the President of the Local Government Board took the view, which was supported by the present Prime Minister, that those compelled to seek employment relief in times of exceptional distress should be deprived of their votes. Some would say he had quoted from the salad days of the right hon. Gentleman, so he would now take his actions since he had become a Minister. Almost his first act was to inform a deputation of the London unemployed that it was only reasonable that workmen employed under the Act should receive less than the standard rate of wages. [Cries of "No."] All that he could say was that the words were taken from *The Times* report. If the right hon. Gentleman did not say that those who claimed such relief under the Act were to receive less than the standard rate of wages, did he declare they should receive the standard rate of wages, and if he did not say either of those things, what did he say? He also wanted to know how the right hon. Gentleman could reconcile his statement that no man was worth more than £500 a year with the fact that he took £2,000 per annum as President of the Local Government Board in order not to become a blackleg. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

MR. CROOKS asked if the words which he overheard the hon. Gentleman say, "I will go on speaking till all is blue" were strictly Parliamentary.

MR. CLAUDE HAY again endeavoured to address the House, but there were further cries of "Withdraw," and the hon. Member then appealed to the Chair.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind hon. Gentlemen that by making use of this form of preventing an hon. Member from speaking they are using rather a dangerous weapon which may be used against themselves. If the hon. Member for Hoxton had said anything which was unparliamentary I should have called upon him to withdraw it. I understand that the expression he used was a quotation and was not an original observation. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will explain.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY said the observation he made was taken from a report which he read in a newspaper of a declaration made by the President of the Local Government Board. The statement he quoted was that the right hon. Gentleman took a salary of £2,000 as President of the Local Government Board because he would not be a blackleg, although he had declared no man was worth more than £500 a year. If he had misrepresented the right hon. Gentleman of course he would be most ready to apologise as he had no desire to make any personal observation. But he claimed he had quoted his words accurately. He had known the right hon. Gentleman for more than twenty years and it was not his desire to try to make capital out of anything of a personal character. He wanted to show that the right hon. Gentleman's public speeches did not convey any confidence to those who took an interest in the unemployed problem. The next step that the right hon. Gentleman took on acceding to office, was when the Tottenham local authority applied for sanction to employ the unemployed upon a swimming bath. The right hon. Gentleman refused official sanction to the arrangement. [Cries of "No."] Then he should be glad to be corrected by the right hon. Gentleman. Again, the actual word the right hon. Gentleman used to the Lambeth Guardians, who desired to acquire land for a farm colony, were—

> "The history of previous experience does not warrant the assumption that the proposal of the guardians is likely to be attended with that measure of success as would justify the large expenditure it would involve."

This tenderness for the interests of the ratepayers' pockets was a new feature in the right hon. Gentleman's character. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the expenditure of public money for farm colonies for the unemployed was more profitable than running empty steamboats upon the Thames. Either the words of the right hon. Gentleman meant nothing, or they meant that he was against farm colonies altogether. The right hon. Gentleman could unquestionably claim that he had more drastic and heroic remedies for unemployment before the recent election. In his election address the right hon. Gentleman used the words—

> "A legal eight hours day is the best means of securing work for all."

He was not quoting from the right hon. Gentleman's revolutionary days, but from the time when he was a Cabinet Minister, and no Cabinet Minister surely would deceive his constituents by advocating that which he believed his colleagues would not allow him to introduce. There was nothing in the King's Speech about an eight hours day, and the House had a right to know whether it was part of the programme of His Majesty's Government or not. When a Minister of the Crown defined an eight hours day as the best means of providing work for all, and there were in London 40,000 men registered as unemployed, of whom 34,000 had received no work by employment relief, but were sent into pauperism or had to starve, the House had a right to know whether the statement of the right hon. Gentleman to his constituents was a mere attempt to get votes, or whether it was part of the policy of the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was a member. On his side of the House they were satisfied that all was not well with British trade and that all could not be well so long as the bitter cry of the workless workman confronted and shamed His Majesty's Ministers who tried to deceive the nation by cries of Chinese slavery and yet left the workmen of our country to starve. He begged to move.

MR. HILLS (Durham) formally seconded the motion.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question to add the words, 'But humbly to represent that whilst Your Majesty records with satisfaction the fact that the imports and exports of the country show a steady and accelerating increase, there is widespread misery among the labouring classes due to want of employment, and this House regrets that no remedy has been proposed in Your Majesty's gracious Speech to prevent the great want of employment which exists."—*(Mr. Claude Hay.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*MR. G. H. ROBERTS (Norwich) said that they of the Labour Party were keenly alive to the problem of the unemployed, but they were not going to be a party to making the matter a peg on which to hang fiscal reform. They had a lively recollection of the fight that arose when the controversy was raised by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, and the suggestion of old age pensions was tacked to it so as to make fiscal reform attractive to the working classes of the country. The Labour representatives were well aware of the fact that unemployment was not peculiar to a free trade country, but was even more widely prevalent in a protectionist country. They were also aware that the largest unemployed army of workers in the world was Coxey's army in the United States. The Labour Party were glad to note that it was the intention of His Majesty's Ministers to introduce a Bill dealing with this subject in due course, and whilst they did not desire to embarrass the Government, they hoped no undue delay would be allowed. He entirely dissociated himself from the remarks of the previous speaker: He did not think anything was to be gained for the cause of the unemployed by making personal attacks upon the President of the Local Government Board. He thought it was bad policy to exploit the poverty of the masses in order to display vindictiveness towards a right hon. Gentleman whom they were pleased to know came from the class they were associated with, for they were glad to know that a member of the working class community was considered to be of sufficient fitness and capacity to occupy a seat in the Cabinet of the nation. During the election campaign, not merely for political purposes, they attempted to prove that unemployment would always be with them so long as industries were unregulated and disorganised as they were to-day. He went so far as to submit that while profit-making was the great end of those engaged in industry, so long would it be that large masses of their fellow men would be begging others to permit them to toil and be denied the possibility of utilising their labour to the best advantage. The Labour Members had affirmed that an eight hours day was necessary. At the present time there were railway servants working twice eight hours per day, and they contended that these long hours were wrong and were one of the great causes of unemployment. If the proposals of the Government took the form of doing anything to regulate the hours of industry, then the Labour Party would be for giving them their whole-hearted support. He hoped that when the Government drafted their Bill it would not follow the lines laid down by the late Government, under which so many inquisitorial questions, repugnant to the unemployed section of the community, had to be put. The Labour Party hoped that the fact of a man being out of work and willing to work would be a sufficient qualification for work being found for him. He hoped that the principle of fair wages would be constantly kept in view by the Government in all their proposals. He claimed that low wages were to-day largely the cause of unemployment. How fiscal reform was going to remedy this they had no evidence to prove to their satisfaction. He knew that their trades unions had had to fight for every concession which had been made. He claimed, on behalf of those organisations, that, by increasing the wages of the working classes, they had enhanced their consuming power, and in that way they had created an extra demand for labour and had to that extent alleviated the severity of the unemployed problem. They claimed that any remedy must have this end in view. They wanted a just and equitable distribution of the wealth of this country, so that no man, woman, or child would be denied the right to exercise to the full the consuming power which was their inherent right. He believed that the Liberal Party were keenly concerned in this problem, but in any case the Labour Party did not intend to allow the problem to be exploited in the interest of fiscal legerdemain. They were willing to wait for the Government proposals, having confidence in the fact that after what had been said they would be able to diagnose the desires and needs of the people, and he hoped those proposals would be of a tangible character and calculated to achieve the ends which they mutually had in view.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The hon. Member for Hoxton has placed on the notice Paper an Amendment in which he expresses regret that the Government is unconcerned with the widespread misery and destitution due to the want of employment. If the hon. Gentleman had confined himself to his Amendment, and to the scope that Amendment would have given him for a useful, impersonal, and practical speech, he might have added to a rather slender Parliamentary reputation. But the hon. Gentleman has used the opportunity, which might have been used in the interest of the poor and for the benefit of the unemployed, for the purpose of instructing and advising the Government, for wasting the time of the House with a *réchauffé* of weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable references to the President of the Local Government Board. To notice them would be to dignify them; to reply to them would give them a substantiality which they lack; and the hon. Member will pardon me if I do not indulge in that recrimination that his attack might provoke—an attack which he must have founded on statements in newspapers as ignorant of my past record on this subject as the hon. Member himself. But the Government has no right to pass over what is substantial in the hon. Gentleman's remarks. The most substantial suggestion is that the Government display unruffled optimism about the condition both of trade and of the unemployed. If that be true—and it is not altogether true—that optimism is shared by the overwhelming majority of the electorate of this kingdom, for they share the view that our exports are good and are increasing, that our exports are large and are improving. Curiously, in the very year that the hon. Gentleman and his tariff reform friends described England as a dying country with vanishing trade and disappearing industries, the heads of those industries stood up and unhesitatingly gave the retort courteous that they had an answer to every one of those statements. The hon. Member proceeded from his misrepresentation of imports and exports to the Return which, at the request of some hon. Members, I issued as a command Paper the other day. I am the more justified in issuing that Return when I find men who should know better telling the country that there are a million able-bodied men in our workhouses. I have a right to point out that that statement is inaccurate, being 8,223 per cent. wrong. Instead of a million able-bodied paupers there are less than 9,000 all told. The hon. Member suggested that that return was compiled to alienate sympathy from the unemployed. It is a remarkable fact that it was compiled mainly at the instigation of those social students who build upon fact so as to enable them to get a correct representation of the problem with which they have to deal. I will not allow any Member or any right hon. Gentleman, however important a position he may occupy in public life, to impugn, without repudiation, the figures issued by our disinterested, neutral, impartial, and well-informed Civil servants, who in these matters are beyond fear and above reproach. What the hon. Member should have done, and has failed to do, is to show in what particular the Return is inaccurate, in what respect it has been cooked. Pending such proof, the Return issued under the signature of the distinguished head of the Local Government Board, Sir Samuel Provis, holds the field in spite of the grotesque insinuations of the hon. Member for Hoxton It has been suggested that 1849 was a significant year with which to begin the Return. There was no choice. It is a curious coincidence that the first reliable Poor Law Return synchronises with the beginning of the free trade era. That is neither my fault nor the fault of the late Mr. Richard Cobden; and instead of its being a subject of reproach to the country that, whilst pauperism, indoor and outdoor, has diminished, the cost of maintaining paupers has increased, it is a subject for congratulation, because it shows that under free trade the Poor Law has been humanised, the workhouse is not the Bastille it used to be, and the hospitals of the old days—the free hospitals outside—are in no sense comparable with the Poor Law infirmaries of to-day, in which the treatment of patients is as good as they can get in the average general hospital supported by voluntary contributions. The fact is that the misery of mankind is not increasing. The sympathy of mankind is expanding, and in no respect is it better shown than in the kindly, humanitarian way in which in recent years the poor in workhouses and infirmaries have been treated. I admit with regret that the number of vagrants is increasing. But that is mainly due to mistaken and indiscriminate charity. Since taking my present office, it has been part of my duty in earning this £2,000 a year to make inquiries into this question, and whilst the hon. Member opposite, perhaps, has been otherwise more pleasantly and, probably, more profitably engaged, I have, in the "wee sma' hours ayont the twal," between twelve and five in the morning, been under Waterloo arch and in places where the poor congregate, endeavouring to obtain some insight into the means by which their lot can be ameliorated, and their numbers reduced. Then the hon. Member for Hoxton asked why I had not given any explanation of the Return we have issued in regard to the number of able-bodied men who have been relieved by local authorities other than Poor Law guardians. There is only one reason, and it is that last year the figures were given in two reports, which are accessible to the hon. Member, as he would have known if he had given as much attention to this subject as he has to studying the interesting details of my autobiography. The number of men relieved by means of relief work by the local authorities last year was about 20,000. It is true, I regret to say, that pauperism to-day is higher than it was some years ago. There are 105,000 more indoor and outdoor paupers in England to-day than five years ago. Why? Because we have been wasting our substance on riotous living. There are 24,000 more indoor and outdoor paupers in London at this moment than five years ago. Why? Because in the last ten years £670,000,000, which should have been spent on reproductive and remunerative works for our skilled and unskilled labourers, has been spent on fireworks in South Africa and other extravagant and futile expenditure for the delectation of mafficking Imperialists, and I must frankly say that the exhibition is not worth the money that has been spent upon it. I have one illustration of that point. I notice that the Irish Members are very properly asking for the amelioration of the lot of the labourers in Ireland. In twenty-eight years private enterprise and State effort has built 25,000 cottages for the Irish people, and those cottages have only cost the sum of money which the last Government spent on chasing the Mad Mullah in Somaliland. If that £4,500,000 had been spent in Ireland even as a free gift, Irish labourers would not have been coming into England as they are to-day and competing with English labourers. Irish bricklayers would not have been competing in the labour market, and that money would have been much more profitably employed. The hon. Member has made a statement which, so far as it affects me, I brush aside. But he has made a reflection on the authors of the last Act and on the Labour Members who watched the progress of the Measure last session. The hon. Member has accused me of suggesting that the men who were employed on relief works set up under the Unemployed Workmen Act should be satisfied with less than the fair or current rate of wages. He ought to know that that statement is far from true. On the contrary, the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil was a member of a deputation, which included the Bishop of Stepney and the Rev. Russell Wakefield, to the Local Government Board; and he will, I am sure, confirm my statement that we insisted upon the current rate of wages being paid; and we properly insisted, as I ever shall insist, so long as I hold my present office, that for relief works under the Unemployed Workmen Act there must always be an incentive for the workmen to resume their normal industrial employment, but that that incentive should take the form not of lower wages per hour, but of fewer hours per day or fewer days per week, so that a man would have an opportunity of looking for his usual and natural employment. It is true that in 1893 and 1894 I said — and I have not changed my opinion materially—that it was a mistake for the Imperal Government to give localities doles and grants indiscriminately except with adequate supervision and control of the expenditure, which is very difficult with relief works. I said that in 1894, and what I have said I have said and adhere to. No doubt I have made a similar remark to that quoted by the hon. Member—that certain men are not worth more than £500 a year. I must have had the hon Member for Hoxton in my mind. As to the Tottenham case which has been quoted, Tottenham applied for a loan of £3,000 for certain recreation-ground work for the unemployed, and my predecessor facilitated the loan. The work was carried out in a way that indicated lack of proper supervision, and there was a loss of £1,000. Tottenham asked that the period of repayment of the loss should be the same as for the loan—viz., twenty-five years. The right hon. Gentleman opposite refused, and I have adhered to that decision. As to the question of the Lambeth farm colony, my withers are unwrung on that question. If the hon. Member knew the facts, instead of disagreeing with me he would rather praise my action. I am bound to subordinate my personal views on many subjects to my official responsibility as guardian of the ratepayers' purse; and I intend to sink the private in the public good. I am not going to allow land agents and others who have got sour and relatively useless lands, unsuitable for farming and agricultural purposes, to palm that land off on innocent town boards of guardians at two or three times the price that it was sold at a short time ago. Therefore, I think I deserve eulogy rather than blame, and I can assure the hon. Member that if he knew as much about that particular colony as I do, he perhaps would have been a little more severe on that district than even I have been. The hon. Member has made a number of silly statements which have been the vogue of ignorant journalists of the Yellow Press brand during the last ten years. Nearly all those allegations have been the subject of investigation at a trial at the Old Bailey lasting for twenty-one days. On that occasion the hon. and learned Member for the City of London pursued me with a speech which was one of the ablest I have ever heard against myself. Yet the jury acquitted me, and no one rejoiced at the verdict more than the distinguished advocate opposed to me. Since that time how things have changed! Twenty years ago I was answering these allegations in the dock at the Old Bailey. Poetic justice, through the good faith and kindness of my fellow countrymen, has now placed on me the responsibility of showing my fellow working-men a quick road out of the crooked path in which many of them have to live, move, and have their being. Curiously, I have with me the very handbill which I handed to the hon. and learned Gentleman twenty years ago. I would ask the House to note the economic soundness and the moderation of our claim in those days as in the present. We asked the Government to relax the severity of the outdoor relief test for able-bodied men. That I have had the proud privilege of doing myself. We asked public bodies to start works at reasonable rates of wages. That is being done, and has been done. We asked the Metropolitan Board of Works to begin public works and build artisans' dwellings. That has since been done to the extent that we have now forty estates in London with 100,000 county council tenants living in them, as against none ten years ago. We asked for the reduction of hours of labour in Government factories to eight hours a day, and I did my best personally to prevail on the present Prime Minister when he was Secretary for War to carry that most useful reform into practice. The next modest thing was that no firm contracting with the Government should pay less than the lowest trade union rate of wages. We asked that a Bill should be introduced reducing the hours of labour on railways, and I am glad to say that has been done, although I think we have not gone far enough. The tramway workers for whom I also pleaded have had a considerable reduction of hours of labour. Last but not least in this modest programme was the call made on the Government, which I understand the Government is not indisposed to agree to, for an international conference of all civilised commercial nations to consider the industrial questions of child labour, the labour of women, work in dangerous trades and a maximum working day. For advocating these modest and moderate instalments of justice the hon. Member tried to make out that we had done some very dreadful things. Sane men do not do dreadful things. England is—

> "A land of just and old renown
> Where Freedom slowly broadens down
> From precedent to precedent."

But "slowly" should be eliminated and "quickly" substituted. Now I must for a moment deal with the allegations of widespread misery before I conclude. It is not true that it prevails to the extent which has been stated. I am not going to shelter myself behind figures and percentages. So long as there is one *bona fide* man or woman, through no fault of his or her own, out of employment, it ought to be the subject of the legitimate concern of every citizen and every Minister. On this subject my convictions are obligations, and as soon as they can be converted into political duty and administrative acts we shall lose no opportunity in so converting them. But you do not improve matters by exaggerating the distress. In 1894 seven per cent. of trade unionists were out of work; in 1904 the figure was 6 per cent.; and in 1905 it was 4 per cent.—a considerable diminution; and I am glad to inform the House that, in the judgment of those experts and specialists who are in a position to know, there is every reason to believe that 1906, 1907, and 1908 will, with the exception of the building trade, probably be the best three years for employment and industry during the last thirty years. My next point is briefly to deal with what has been called the "widespread misery" of the unemployed as registered by the unemployed district committees. And here I must ask that the facts shall be allowed to temper the statement of the hon. Member. There are ninety distress committees throughout the kingdom. Eight only in Scotland have asked for grants from the Queen's Unemployed Fund, five only from Wales, and practically there has been no demand from Ireland until the other day, when the Committee did their best to satisfy Ireland's demand for a share. The hon. Member himself admitted that under the distress committees 8,000 workmen in London are kept going.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: Eight thousand out of 42,000.

MR. JOHN BURNS: It is not the fault of the committees nor of the Government that the proportion to the number unemployed is so small. It is due to the fact that it is a new organisation and that the committees have great difficulty in doing their work. Hon Members who go further than I do on this unemployed question must admit that, so far as the Local Government Board are concerned, they have stimulated these distress committees to get to work and have supplied them with funds. We have revised the inquisitorial character of the inquiries, and we have made regulations under which these distress committees can do their work. So much for the criticism of the hon. Member. The only thing I have now to do is just briefly to tell the House where this unemployed question is as raised in the Amendment. At the present moment—and the House must be told this, because these are significant facts which must influence any President of the Local Government Board or Government—we have a Royal Commission sitting on the Poor Law, and, under the second term of their reference, they are to inquire into the various means outside the Poor Law for meeting distress arising from want of employment during periods of industrial depression. Beyond that, the Commission will have to consider the Unemployed Workmen Act—its object and its scope. The Vagrancy Committee, also dealing with another aspect of the unemployed problem, has concluded its labours, and a valuable and interesting report will be in the hands of Members next week. We have a Small Holdings

Committee dealing with a not unimportant phase of the unemployed problem. I believe we shall have great difficulty in getting town dwellers back to the land. It will be more easy to prevent people from coming to the towns, and the Government have wisely decided, as has been announced to-night by the President of the Board of Trade, to institute a Committee that shall be short, sharp, practical and businesslike, to take into consideration the questions of afforestation, the reclamation of waste lands, coast protection, coast erosion, and so forth. I can only say that so far as our Department is able to facilitate that work we shall do our very best. One other point I think it is right to mention to the House. My distinguished colleague the Secretary of State for War has, at the request of those who know this unemployment question well, done a very sensible and practical thing—he is going to give twenty battalions of Militia their training in the winter and during the slackest period of their year. I believe the whole of the Militia might receive their training at the periods which synchronizes with the slackest period of their normal unemployment. Miners, who are busiest in winter, might receive their training in June and July, while, on the other hand, bricklayers' labourers, and men of that class, who have a slack time in winter, might receive their training at that season. But, perhaps, better than all I have mentioned—and I hope the House will pardon me for doing it—is that I have called into conference at the Local Government Board a number of the largest employers of casual labour in this country, those who employ men at intermittent work, to see whether, by appealing to them to set their own house in order, they cannot on their own initiative, and by consultation with each other, mitigate the precariousness of dock, gas-work, and brickfield labour. The hon. Member says that whatever you do you will not seriously affect the problem of the unemployed unless you deal with the question of tariff reform. Two and a half years ago when this question of tariff reform was first brought forward I ventured to say that the agitation and its authors would be "snowed in." My prediction has come true. Not only has the tariff reform Party been "snowed under," but an avalanche has hit them in the midriff. To paraphrase that Americanism, "The subsequent proceedings interest us no more." I venture to say that I have one remedy for unemployment. I believe that what this country wants is immunity from war. I believe that industry is hungering for peace, and that commerce wants economy and retrenchment in every department, and above all, hon. Members must not forget which trades had the largest amount of unemployment. The cotton trade had never had such a good year. The shipbuilding trade last year excelled even its own splendid annals of prosperity. Iron and steel, engineering and machinery, have reached a record in the very years when we were told that the undertaker or the broker's man was to visit them. The trade which has the largest number of unemployed is the building trade. Five years before the war there were only 2 per cent. in that trade out of work, but that percentage is now six times larger. There are no foreigners in the building trade. It is not touched or affected in the least by foreign competition. If the tariff reform proposals were introduced, and if materials were taxed on coming into the country, it would be worse for the building trade. There is simply one reason why the builders are out of work. Since the war the rate of interest on money for private enterprise has risen from 2 per cent. to 3½, 4, and 5 per cent. Let me "bovrilise" these facts. Five years before the war there were 1,012 private Bills got through the House of Commons.

Many of these meant the expenditure of £10,000,000, £15,000,000 or £20,000,000 on gas works, electric lighting, tramways, housing, and municipal undertakings. Since the war dear money has prevailed, and local authorities have had high rates. They have withheld the promotion of public works which would otherwise have given employment to a large number of men. The result has been that the number of men unemployed in the building trade has been considerably increased. I am glad to say that the building trade is improving. That improvement will go on as money becomes cheap and as the general trade of the country improves. I beg the House to assist in providing real remedies, but not the economic quackeries that are often suggested, not fiscal fallacies, where the remedy would be worse than the disease, not the proposals of visionary politicians which would sap the independence of the people, postpone permanent reform, and do damage both to the community and the individual by proceeding on the unsound economic lines which these pernicious remedies too often take. The greatest means for the improvement of trade is that in the next twenty years we should not have fourteen wars and expeditions as we had in the last ten years. What we have to do is not to spend so much money on wasteful expenditure, abroad, but to concentrate our efforts on remunerative expenditure at home; help industries in their natural expansion so that they can absorb what are now displaced. What we have clearly to recognise is that it is not sufficient to provide men with irregular work; that it is not sufficient to provide transient relief works. I believe that the best remedy you can provide for unskilled labour, apart from giving steady work, is to see that the wages paid are such that the workman would have a margin wherewith to insure against unemployment. Less money should be wasted on drinking and betting, and wiser provision should be made for the exercise of true providence in the best sense of the word. These are only some out of many of the suggestions that might be made for the betterment of the unemployed. If time permited, and if this were the occasion, I could go into more of the things which the Government have in contemplation. There is no royal road to economic reform or social revolution. The remedies for the unemployed are as numerous as the causes are multifarious. It is the business of the Government to take occasion by the hand, and to help the unemployed whenever that is possible. So far the Government have lost no opportunity of helping the unemployed on every possible occasion, as the several measures in the King's Speech indicate, and I sincerely regret that the time of the House in the debate on the King's Speech should have been more or less wasted, as it has been, in the discussion of this subject to-night.

I trust that I have dealt with the Amendment to the satisfaction of the House generally. I hope I have done it in a tone and temper that have commended my observations to the House. I thank the House for having listened to me so kindly. I would be inhuman if I did not say that I thank the House from the bottom of my heart for enabling me, the first of the ancient lowly, to stand at this box after twenty years to repeat in the same form, and to commend to the House of Commons, what in the old dark days of the unemployed I pressed on the public attention with much less notice. To-night I speak under circumstances and with an environment which are more congenial to me than in the days when I had to appear in the dock of the Old Bailey, where I first met the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the City of London.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said the President of the Local Government

Board had given an outline of some of the questions with which the Government proposed to deal in connection with the unemployed problem. He mentioned small holdings, and it was to that subject that he himself desired to refer. The question of unemployment was closely tied up with the agricultural question, and he was glad to know that the Government proposals included the remedy of bringing the people back to the land. In endeavouring to find a remedy for the exodus from the rural districts, it was well to look for a moment to the cause of it. It was said during the election, and since then in this House, that the people had been driven from the land by the wickedness of the landlords. He submitted that that was not so. He maintained that they must look further than the landlords for the cause of agricultural depression. To adopt any drastic system of taking people back from the towns to the land, without providing any profitable employment for them, would be a failure. It would be putting the cart before the horse. The people who were brought back to the land must be enabled to cultivate it profitably. Something must be done to revive the agricultural industry. One of the reasons why the agricultural industry required reviving was that we had not produced agricultural commodities sufficiently, and that we had imported too much. Why was it that we imported annually 7,500,000 bushels of onions, between 3,500,000 and 10,000,000 cwts. of potatoes, and £5,000,000 worth of fruit? In January this year we imported 30,000 cwts. of foreign hops. He mentioned fruit and hops because he believed the cultivation of these products required a greater amount of labour than any other cultivation that could be named. One of the best methods, in his opinion, that the Government could adopt in order to bring the people back to the land was to do something to encourage the fruit industry and the hop industry. It was said that the hop and fruit growers wanted protection. What they wanted was to be able to enter our markets with their produce on the same terms as foreigners entered with their produce. Give them fair trade and their farmers would be able to compete. Something should be done for the hop and fruit industry, for if the farmers and fruit growers had fair play, or real free trade, they could meet any competition in the world. We imported too much, and produced too little, and no one would suggest that that was a good thing for our working classes. He hoped that this question of the right of entering foreign markets would be considered by even this Free Trade Government. The present Government, above all others, ought to deal with the question of "back to the land," and the easiest way of doing so would be by reviving our great national industry.

*Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said he could not quite agree with the right hon. the President of the Local Government Board in his remarks about the fireworks in South Africa. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that these fireworks had been caused by the invasion of our country by the Boers and by their insulting *ultimatum.* If the right hon. Gentleman looked back in history he would see that no great nation had ever been able to go on for any great length of time without a big war. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that fiscal reform was practically dead and buried. He begged to differ from him entirely. They were told quite recently by Lord Avebury and by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil that, in spite of booming trade, unemployment was getting worse andworse. The Member for Merthyr Tydvil said that the misery caused by want of work was very terrible and continuous, so that the booming trade did not seem to have done the working people very much good. [Cries of "Divide."] He did not come to the House with the intention of speaking, but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman what he proposed to do in this case? The First Lord of the Admiralty had much work to do for the British Navy, but the Government contractors, Messrs. Jackson, told them that they were going to buy all the granite they required for the Keyham Harbour Works in Norway because they could get it cheaper there than here, and that the reason of that was because the Norwegian workman got only about half the wages the British workman required. An hon. Gentleman had said that the British Government should be a model employer, and should pay the union rate of wages; but, he asked, did they insist on the foreign employer of labour paying the same rate of wages as here? And if not, how were they going to give employment to the British workman if they got goods from foreign countries at cheaper rates than they could be obtained at here? Take the wool industry. The tax in America on woollen goods was £94 for every £100 worth. The consequence was that America kept its own market to itself, and sent its surplus goods to this country free and sold them at cost price, or sometimes at less than cost price. While imports from this country were heavily taxed—Lord Kelvin said at about the rate of 12½ per cent.—the Americans sent their goods over here without paying a halfpenny for their admission. Therefore we were practically paying the Americans £10 or £12 upon every £100 of goods received. That was the way in which it appeared to him. He thought at all events that it was very well worth the while of those who represented labour to look very closely into the matter in order to see whether it was not possible that those who believed in free imports were wrong and that the whole of the rest of the civilised world right.

Question put, "To add at the end of the Address, 'But humbly to represent that, whilst Your Majesty records with satisfaction the fact that the imports and exports of the country show a steady and accelerating increase, there is widespread misery among the labouring classes due to want of employment, and this House regrets that no remedy has been proposed in Your Majesty's gracious Speech to prevent the great want of employment which exists.'"

Question negatived, and Main Question again proposed.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he had to move an Amendment to the Address in regard to throwing the cost of the maintenance of the public roads upon the Imperial Exchequer. He was bringing the subject forward in accordance with a promise which he made in his election address. [MINISTERIAL Laughter.] Evidently, from those cheers, hon. Members opposite were astonished at any one endeavouring to redeem promises given at the election. The reason he had interested himself in the matter was that if his suggestion were adopted the main roads of England would be kept in a better condition and the ratepayers in the country districts would be materially relieved. The main roads of England were daily becoming more used, and although they were better than in days gone by they left a good deal to be desired. He thought the system in France was one which might be adopted with great advantage to ourselves. There were national roads supported by the State and other roads in the maintenance of which the State assisted. Under these circumstances the roads in France left but little to be desired. This subject had already engaged the attention of several Commissions, and the Local Taxation Commission of 1900 recommended that one half of the expense of the national roads should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. Two secretaries of the Treasury concurred in that view, and there were also references made to the subject by the Committee on Highways, which reported in 1903. He was afraid that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be able to give him a very sympathetic answer, but he had no doubt that the President of the Local Government Board would give the matter his attention, as the question was of the utmost importance in the rural districts.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words ;—'But humbly regret that no mention is made of any arrangement for making the maintenance of public roads a charge on the Imperial Exchequer. '"—(*Colonel Lockwood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I think the right hon. Gentleman will agree that this is a matter which we cannot well deal with until we come to consider the question of local taxation, and I promise to consider the matter then.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD intimated that in view of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.
Colonel Lockwood.

Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

SUPPLY.

Resolved, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Ordered, That the several Estimates presented to this House during the present session be referred to the Committee of Supply.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1889) AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 27th February, 1906.

The Lord Middleton took the Oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Tables showing the extent in statute acres and the produce of the crops for the year 1905.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Report for the year 1904 on the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Colleges of Science and of Art, the Geological Survey and Museum, and on the work of the Solar Physics Committee.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (PROVISIONAL ORDERS), SESSION 1906.

Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, and the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, Amendment Act.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHS STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1906. NO. 136).

The Telegraph (Inland Written Telegram) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1906, dated 1st January, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Scheme for the management of the Crewkerne Grammar School Foundation, in the parish of Crewkerne, in the county of Somerset, founded by John Combe in or about the year 1499, regulated by a scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts on 21st July, 1876, as altered by schemes of the Charity Commissioners of the 30th November, 1877, and the 23rd February, 1883, and as amended by a scheme made under the said Acts on the 3rd October, 1895. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 17.)

THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.

The adjourned debate arising out of a question put by Viscount Milner—namely "Whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies could give the House any information as to the form of the proposed Constitutions of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State"—was resumed by

Lord BURGHCLERE, who said: My Lords, I am sure that none of your Lordships, on whichever side of the House you sit, or whatever your political opinions may be, could have helped listening to the speech of the noble Viscount who initiated this debate last night with respect and admiration. Moreover, whatever our opinions as to the conclusions of the noble Viscount may have been, I am certain we could not help feeling considerable sympathy with so distinguished a public servant, whose first speech in Parliament was made, to a certain extent, in defence of a much attacked policy in which he has played a large part. The noble Viscount told us that he approached this subject in no partisan spirit. That is an attitude we should have expected from one who has occupied the positions which the noble Viscount has filled in the past; and I am sure the noble Viscount could have felt no reason for complaint in the speech of my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who explained the policy of His Majesty's Government in a spirit not unduly hostile towards the noble Viscount.

If I understand the speech of the noble Viscount aright, as far as the establishment, or I would say the ultimate establishment, of constitutions in these two colonies is concerned, there is no difference in particular between my noble friend the Colonial Secretary and the noble Viscount; for the noble Viscount himself told us that the complete self-government of these Colonies, on a basis of political equality of all white men, was the only possible, and, I think, desirable, goal of the policy which he himself initiated in South Africa. Therefore, my Lords, if His Majesty's Government and the noble Viscount are agreed in this ultimate policy, the only point in dispute between them, as I understand it, though

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

I admit it is a very important point, is as to the psychological moment at which responsible government should be given. His Majesty's Government think that that time has arrived, while the noble Viscount takes a somewhat Cassandra-like view of the present situation.

We all listened to the somewhat pessimistic forebodings of the noble Viscount with the attention which remarks from one speaking with his high authority undoubtedly deserve; but I think I am right in saying that there was one somewhat remarkable omission in the speech of the noble Viscount. Whilst he told us what his own opinion on the subject was, he did not indicate to us the opinion of our British fellow-subjects in the Transvaal and in the Orange River Colony on the question of the immediate grant of free institutions. After all, if this experiment should be a failure, our British fellow-subjects in South Africa will be the ones who will suffer first.

VISCOUNT MILNER: Hear, hear!

LORD BURGHCLERE: Therefore, if they, in conjunction with the Boers, are at the present moment desirous of having free institutions granted to them, the objections of the noble Viscount lose some of their force. I admit that the Orange River Colony presents a problem of considerable difficulty, but surely it does not pass the wit of man to devise some protection in the franchise for the British minority if protection is necessary in the circumstances of the case. The noble Viscount dwelt very much upon the irritated feelings of the Boers. It is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that there is a great deal of irritation, and natural irritation, among the Boers at the present moment; but the question for the Government and for the country is this, whether you are likely to allay that irritation by putting off the granting of free institutions till the Greek Kalends. For my part, I venture to think that with a strong and capable governor such as I know Lord Selborne to be, with a considerable force at his back, we may, notwithstanding the warnings of the noble Viscount, to which I myself listened with the greatest respect, contemplate the proposal of His Majesty's Government with considerable hope and confidence.

The vital question, and the question which His Majesty's Government are perfectly right in considering with the closest attention, is the question of the franchise in the Transvaal. That is a subject on which we have not yet received a decisive statement from His Majesty's Ministers, and which they are no doubt considering.

I understand that there are two parties there, and that it may be possible, under the franchise, to bring about a most unfortunate state of ascendancy for one party or the other. But I would express the hope that in giving this franchise there will be no gerrymandering, in order that one party or the other shall have superiority in the Legislature of the Transvaal. I hope that His Majesty's Government will be able to create a franchise which will alleviate, and not accentuate, those unfortunate racial differences which exist in that country. If this was capable of being mathematically accomplished, a very unexpected state of things might take place. Both parties might be returned in equal number, and then a block, an *impasse*, would be created to public business. I venture to think that if that did happen, the state of things then brought about would lead to a compromise between the two parties and might tend towards alleviating rather than emphasising the racial differences to which I have referred. I am certain that all those who think that the proper moment has arrived will welcome two more self-govering Colonies, for the granting of free institutions is the only method of binding together the Empire.

I had no intention of speaking to-day. I came down to your Lordships' House yesterday expecting the usual debate to take place, and I merely mean, to intrude for a few moments on the subject of Chinese labour. I was rather sorry when I saw that the noble Lord opposite, Lord Harris, was to speak directly after the noble Viscount had initiated the debate. I had rather hoped that the attention of your Lordships would have been concentrated on the most important subject of establishing this Colonial Legislature, and that the question of Chinese labour would be deferred till another day. But when I listened to the speech of the noble Viscount I recognised how impossible it was to keep the subject of Chinese labour out of the discussion. It appears that this burning question, which seems to have usurped in popular opinion the fiscal question, is so far-reaching that, according to the noble Viscount, even the institution of free legislatures in the Colonies depends, and depends absolutely, on the maintenance of Chinese labour in South Africa. The noble Viscount told us that the key of the situation was the prosperity of the Transvaal Colony. He then told us that the prosperity of the Transvaal depended upon cheap labour in the mines; and it therefore follows, I think, by a sort of apostolic succession that you would be unable, according to his idea, to give a free legislature to either the Orange River Colony or the Transvaal without the maintenance of Chinese labour.

I have never in your Lordships' House spoken on the subject of the employment of Chinese coolies in the mines of the Transvaal, but I confess that, like other noble Lords, I have frequently spoken on that subject on platforms in the country; and as we are accused, not for the first time, of being afraid to repeat in Parliament what we have stated on the platforms in the country, I should like in a very few words to be allowed to tell your Lordships what I have said on this subject on the many occasions when it has been my good fortune to speak at political meetings. The Liberal Party has been accused in Parliament, in the Press, and on the platform of having won the late general election by misrepresentation on the Chinese labour question. I hope I shall not offend noble Lords opposite when I say that I view that accusation with considerable calm. I have heard it before. I have had some experience of general elections during the last twenty-five years of political life, and I cannot call to mind a single general election, and perhaps not even a single by-election, when the Party who has lost has not accused the winning Party of having won by misrepresentation. Misrepresentation in political life is a sort of inevitable formula.

So far as I am concerned, I associate myself with my noble friends the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council. I have never used the word "slavery" in connection with Chinese labour, because I did not think it was the right word to describe it. But I do not say this in any Pharisaical spirit, or as putting myself up as better than those who did. Any one who thinks this is slavery has a right to say so. The fact is, the whole of this question of misrepresentation arises from the fact that there are in this country, as in other countries, a certain number of warm-hearted, high-minded people, with a passionate love of the liberty of all people, whether white, black, or yellow, and those people look upon all coloured indentured labour with considerable suspicion; and when that indentured labour is coupled with an Ordinance so loosely drawn and administered that within eighteen months it had to be twice amended; when also it gives rise, as is admitted, to illegal and cruel punishments and other irregularities, how can you wonder that they condemn the conditions of labour under this Ordinance in the strongest possible terms? I heard a noble Lord opposite accusing them, and such as them, of fighting under the flag of slavery. I venture to think, with all submission, that these people were fighting under the flag of liberty. Though it is quite possible that the premises upon which they founded their opinion were mistaken, I think, with all submission, that those who hold such strong opinions on this subject would be far better employed in exposing the flimsy fallacies of this misrepresentation than in indulging in acrimonious censure of those who were actuated by honest, if they were perhaps mistaken, convictions.

In saying that I never applied the term "slavery" to this Ordinance, I admit that I am at once open to the not very courteous retort made by an hon. Member in the other House to my noble friend Lord Crewe that—

> "Lord Crewe must remember that he had not to be elected to Parliament."

That is perfectly true; but if the noble Lord had not to be elected himself, he was very busy on many platforms in the country getting other people elected. No doubt there has been in the constituencies during the general election a sort of efflorescence of argument on this subject. If so, I regret it; but to my mind it is an inevitable effect of our Party system. For myself, I venture to tell your Lordships that I belong to an old-fashioned Party who think that it is far better to understate your argument than to overstate it, because, in the case of over-emphasis, of exaggeration, of argument, your opponent, when he has got a bad case, naturally diverts attention from his inability in this direction by fixing the attention of the public on the alleged exaggerations you have made. I do not know whether that has occurred lately, but I have known it occur over and over again in political life.

I regret that there has been this over-emphasis. The noble Marquess opposite, the Marquess of Salisbury, declared the other night in the debate on the Address that His Majesty's Government had attained their present position only by the obvious misrepresentations about Chinese labour of their followers in the country. I must say, with all due deference to noble Lords opposite, that I never heard such a bad compliment paid to a political party by one of its own leaders. I have had some experience of the situation. I have been on many platforms and in many constituencies, but I have never been in one in which there has not been an able Conservative candidate, with all the sources of information on this subject open to him; and yet the noble Marquess tells the House that these candidates were absolutely unable, with all the knowledge at their back, to refute the flimsy fallacies that were put forward by the Liberal candidates. Never in the course of my life have I heard such a sweeping condemnation of an historical Party and its leaders! As to Chinese labour, your Lordships will admit that when the question was originally introduced no one seemed to desire it. Every one deplored what, not to offend noble Lords opposite I will describe as the necessity for the employment of yellow labour in South Africa. The noble Marquess himself deplored the necessity of its introduction; and, unless my memory serves me badly, the noble Marquess the leader of the Opposition also regretted the necessity of its introduction. Sir Arthur Lawley, in receiving a deputation of Boers in South Africa, declared that he did not want it. There were many, and obvious, reasons why yellow labour was repugnant to the people of this country. It is well known that these large aggregations of Chinese in white Colonies bring about conditions which are, to say the least, undesirable. The most reverend Primate has dealt with this subject in your Lordships' House and out of it, and by letters, and I will not go further into it. There was another objection to the introduction of Chinese labour. Nobody wanted to make South Africa a Chinese province—I do not mean politically, but by population; and therefore it was one of the objections to yellow labour that it was absolutely impossible, under the conditions under which it had to be introduced, for the Chinese to go to South Africa as ordinary settlers. They could not be settlers when they came in, and therefore it is no exaggeration to say that they did not go to South Africa as free men.

What I have said on platforms on this subject is this—that the Liberal Party opposed the introduction of Chinese labour in South Africa, that they washed their hands of it, that they refused responsibility for its introduction, and reserved to themselves the right, if they came into power, to review the whole subject. I ventured to say also that the probable result would be that when they did come into power they would alter the Ordinance so as to bring it into consonance with the best traditions of the British Empire, and then leave the Transvaal to settle what is purely a domestic question. I went further, and said that if His Majesty's late Government took upon themselves the responsibility of introducing yellow labour after the warnings they had received from the other side, they could only properly do so if they could prove three propositions—first, that no other labour was available; secondly, that the prosperity of the Colony demanded the instant working of the mines; and thirdly, that the people of the Transvaal agreed to it. I venture to say, as a man in the street, that these three propositions had not been proved by His Majesty's late Government when they brought in the Chinese Ordinance. I am glad to say that I am not alone in that opinion. I even receive some support, if I put the right interpretation upon his words, from Mr. Chamberlain himself. My noble friend the Secretary of State yesterday gave us some quotations from speeches of Mr. Chamberlain, but he did not bring that history up to date. He omitted to quote what I think is the most important speech of all, the speech which Mr. Chamberlain made on Friday last in the House of Commons, in which he said, speaking of his interview with the mine managers in the Transvaal—

> "I told them that they must exhaust every means in their power to secure labour from other sources, and that even when they had done that, as long as I remained at the Colonial Office I would never consent to the introduction of Chinese labour, unless I were persuaded that it was the desire of the people of the Transvaal."

No one, I am sure, would accuse Mr. Chamberlain of having anything but the most ardent desire for the prosperity and welfare of South Africa; and, speaking in the Transvaal, with all the knowledge of his power as Colonial Secretary, he said deliberately that he did not desire the introduction of Chinese labour. If the prosperity of South Africa depended entirley upon Chinese labour, and Mr. Chamberlain, speaking with all the authority and knowledge that he had at that moment, said he did not desire it, then I venture to think it follows that either in Mr. Chamberlain's mind there must have been some other course which His Majesty's Government might have adopted, or the prosperity of the mines did not necessitate instant working. Then Mr. Chamberlain said—

> "Unless I was persuaded it was the desire of the people of the Transvaal."

We have not been persuaded that it is the general desire of the Transvaal. His Majesty's Government are now going to give the Transvaal, by free legislature and responsible Government, an opportunity of saying whether or not they desire that Chinese labour shall be employed. I may be told that these remarks by Mr. Chamberlain were made before the Ordinance was brought forward, but I find that this is also his present opinion, for Mr. Chamberlain said, a little later on in the speech—

> "I do not myself think"

that is now at the present time

> "that Chinese labour is desirable in the mines of the Transvaal."

As I have said, I am glad to find that His Majesty's Government are in accord in this direction with Mr. Chamberlain, because they propose to set up a freely elected and responsible legislature which will be able, as Mr. Chamberlain desired, to decide the domestic question whether Chinese labour should be employed or not. I myself believe that that is the proper course to adopt. But I am bound to say that the constitution of these legislatures must form a most anxious, arduous, and difficult task for His Majesty's Government. At the same time, although I see difficulties, although I understand the difficulties, I have considerable trust and confidence in the wisdom and moderation of my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in the wisdom and moderation of Lord Selborne, and I think we may look forward with hope, perhaps with confident hope, to the success of this new and critical departure, which His Majesty's Government have agreed to adopt. I am certain that my noble friend the Secretary of State will be guided in the conduct of this difficult question, as all other Secretaries of State, from whatever Party they come, have been guided, not by the exigencies of Party system, but solely by a desire for the closer union of the self-governing Colonies and the prosperity, honour, and peace of the Empire at large.

*EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, as a soldier sitting on the Cross Benches in your Lordships' House, I do not consider it my business, as a rule, to take any part in debates on political subjects; and I certainly would not do so on the present occasion did I not feel that were I to keep silent I should justly lay myself open to the reproach of having deserted men to whom the success of the late war was in a great measure due, and whose help to me personally during that war was of the greatest value.

The noble Viscount who opened this debate in a remarkably instructive and interesting speech, worthy, if I may say so, of the great cause which he has at heart, spoke in strong terms of the disastrous effect which a change in policy would inevitably have on our position in South Africa. But, strong as those terms were, in my opinion they are justified by the existing state of affairs in that country; and while I deeply regret that the noble Lord should have good cause to fear calamitous results from such a change, I must declare myself as entirely in accord with the views expressed by him.

Moreover, I venture to assert that any such change as the noble Lord so greatly dreads would be at variance with the opinion held by every one intimately acquainted with, and who has recent experience of, South Africa and its people, or who can speak with any authority as to the relative positions of those who are for and those who are against us in that country. You are not now legislating for a Colony composed entirely of men of British blood, nor for one composed of mixed races who have become welded into one loyal whole by the passing of years; but for a Colony the majority of the inhabitants of which were in arms against us quite a short time ago, and of whom a certain number do not even take the trouble to conceal their disloyalty, not to say their animosity toward Great Britain. The demands of these men are stated in the plainest possible terms in the letter addressed by Mr. Steyn to Mr. Stead, which was published in *The Times* a short while ago; and those demands would be met in full if Chinese labour were dispensed with under the present conditions of the country, and if the basis of representation in the Transvaal were altered to the detriment of the British residents in that Colony.

In the autumn of 1904 I revisited South Africa; and, from the knowledge then gained, I arrived at the conclusion that the acute crisis was over, and that, so far as the white races are concerned, the country was gradually settling down. I came across many farmers, both in the Orange River Colony and in the Transvaal, some of whom had been sent across the seas as prisoners of war. They showed absolutely no bitterness of feeling. On the contrary, they received me in a friendly mannner, and expressed themselves as quite willing to fall in with the new order of things. They invited me into their houses, and told me with evident pride that their children were getting on well with the English language. Their wives were equally friendly in their welcome. The one complaint which the farmers made was the absence of means by which their produce could be taken to the nearest market, and they begged me to do all I could to get the construction of railways pushed forward.

But at the same time in each Colony, except Natal, agitators were busily engaged in endeavouring to create dissatisfaction, and in stirring up mischief through the local Press; and it is these same agitators who are now fomenting a feeling of disloyalty to the British Crown. Surely we do not intend to forsake the men who came forward in the hour of our need? The return which I hold in my hand shows that no less than 46,858 South African Colonials took part in the war. Of these 1,473 were killed or died of wounds; 1,607 died of disease, 3,333 were wounded, 1,230 were captured by the enemy, and 544 were returned as missing, making a total of 8,187—a very heavy casualty roll, my Lords, nearly 18 per cent. of the number engaged. The message from those who fell is inscribed on many a tombstone in South Africa—it runs as follows—

> "Tell England, ye who pass this monument,
> that we in serving her rest here content."

The services of these men, as I have already stated, were of the greatest possible value. They took part in almost every engagement. They saved the day at Wagon Hill, and they were far and away the most useful scouts and guides we had. These men, and many others of our race who have settled in South Africa since the war, have at least as great a claim to be considered as the Boers; and surely it would be an act of injustice to establish such an order of things in the new Colonies as would place the balance of power in the hands, not of those who fought for Great Britain, but of men who fought against us and who it is not in human nature to suppose can in so short a space of time be altogether loyally disposed towards our flag. Unless, therefore, the franchise in the Transvaal is settled on a fair basis as regards the British portion of the population, our late opponents would have an entire and most unfair control over the great industries in which so much British capital has been invested, and on the sympathetic encouragement of which the future prosperity of the whole of South Africa so materially depends.

Sound statesmanship I conceive to be that which establishes, as far as is possible, order and contentment in the land. I fear there will be neither order nor contentment in the new Colonies if we make them over to men many of whom have never disguised the fact that their sole desire is to drive us out of the country—a desire which they will assuredly endeavour to fulfil on the first favourable opportunity. I cannot believe, my Lords, that, after a war which cost us so many valuable lives and an expenditure of 240 millions sterling, the British public would knowingly consent at this juncture to a change in policy; for if they did, it would be an absolutely convincing proof of their forgetfulness of the past, of their complete ignorance of what is best in the interests of their own country, and of what is of infinitely greater importance, their discreditable abandonment of men who fought and bled for us, and who are amongst the most loyal of His Majesty's subjects.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, I have only recently returned from South Africa, having spent a considerable portion of the last eighteen months in that country. I have had the opportunity of travelling over most of Cape Colony, through the Orange River Colony and through the Transvaal as far north as the Zambesi. I have also visited Natal and the native territories and Basutoland, and I could not justify to my conscience, after what I have heard and seen in South Africa, and after what I have heard since I came back, being altogether silent on the present occasion. There are three points I should like to impress on your Lordships—the profound divergence of opinion which exists between what we hear in this country and what we hear in South Africa; the evils that arise from Colonial affairs being made the sport of Party politics at home; and the absolute necessity, if South Africa is to prosper, of a consistent and continuous policy with regard to it. I speak in the interests of no Party. I doubt if there is a Member of your Lordship's House who is more detached from Party than I am; but I do wish to bear witness to what I have seen and heard.

Now, my Lords, take this question of Chinese labour. Here it has been represented as a question between white labour and coloured labour. In South Africa every one knows, and no one disputes that it is a question, not between white labour and coloured labour, but between Chinese labour and native labour. Here it has been represented as a question affecting the interests of the mining community in the Transvaal. In South Africa I venture to say you will not find any one who does not assert and believe that the development of the mining industry is of absolute importance not merely to the Transvaal, but to the whole future of South Africa. Here we have heard a great deal said about the ill-treatment of the Chinese. In South Africa I was not able to find anyone, with but one exception, who believed for a moment that the Chinese were ill-treated, or who saw any of the moral objections to the use of the Chinese which have been brought forward in England. They might not like the employment of Chinese; but they thought it a necessity. They knew that it was impossible to work the mines by white labour for various reasons, which those who are acquainted with South Africa know, and which I need not detain your Lordships by referring to this evening.

I took some trouble to ascertain whether the mines might have been worked by the Kaffirs without recourse to Chinese labour. When I was travelling through the native territories I had an opportunity of meeting the agents employed to recruit the Kaffirs for the mines. Their general and universal opinion was that, though a larger number of Kaffirs might have been recruited, the supply would have been insufficient. The natives had been very much spoiled by the war; they had become rich; they had got all they wanted; they did not wish to work; and owing to the wise provisions of the noble Viscount who introduced this debate yesterday for the development of railway and agricultural work, and for other objects of national benefit, the supply of natives was insufficient to work the mines. Therefore, if the mines were to be worked, you were compelled to have recourse to other sources of labour. I do not think that the noble Earl who is now Secretary of State for the Colonies will altogether dispute this fact.

In regard to the treatment of the Chinese, the Nonconformists in South Africa, such members of Roman Catholic missions as I had occasion to see, and the English bishops, all disapproved of the kind of things that have been said in England. I took the opportunity to visit a Chinese compound myself at a time when visitors were not expected. I conversed with the Chinese through their interpreter; I saw their houses, their food, their baths, and inquired as to their wages. I can only say that many labourers in England would be glad if they were as well off. I do not think, so far as one had an opportunity of ascertaining, that there was anything the Chinese labourers dreaded more than being repatriated to their own country.

One other word with regard to Chinese labour. We have heard something about the outrages consequent on the introduction of that class of labour. I think that most people in South Africa will say that, in view of the number of Chinese now employed, the outrages have been remarkably few. I am satisfied that they would have been much larger in extent had the labourers been of other nationalities. This is not merely an opinion; it is the result of some knowledge of the facts. Some time back a large number of European navvies were employed in railway work at Potchefstroom in the Transvaal. Their conduct was such that no decent woman ventured out of the house on Sundays, and the men had, in point of fact, to be sent back. I do not wish to emphasise that; but in regard to the question of Chinese labour I am obliged to say that I do think the amount of misrepresentation, I will not use a stronger word, that has taken place in England on that subject passes all that is permissible, even in times of political excitement.

But, my Lords, this question of Chinese labour does not stand alone as showing the divergence that exists between opinion here and opinion in South Africa. We appear to think, and I think there has been evidence of that feeling during this debate, that we understand the affairs of South Africa better than the Colonists themselves; that it is our duty to guide them in the paths of virtue, and that, although they are men of our blood, they are not altogether to be trusted in respect to many matters. It is impossible to conceive an opinion more directly at variance with the opinion entertained by the Colonists themselves. They say, and they say, I think, with a great deal of truth, that Colonial affairs excite very little interest in England except when something particular attracts attention, and when that is the case they are then made the sport of political Parties. They say that at other times their affairs are treated with neglect and indifference; and, my Lords, is it possible, when we look back at the history of South Africa, to deny that there is truth in this allegation?

No one will accuse me of indifference to the welfare of the native races. We are all agreed that slavery should be put down, but there is no one who knows the history of the suppression of the slave trade in South Africa who will not say that the measures taken to deprive the Boers of their slaves were unjust and ill-considered, and that the method in which it was done laid the seeds of that antagonism between the English and the Dutch races which we have had so much occasion to deplore. No one, I think, will question his ability or his honesty, but no one, I think, can contend that the action taken by a relation of my own, the late Lord Grey, in trying to force convict labour on South Africa, was wise.

in view of the prejudices of the Colony. What are we to say of the recall of Sir George Gray—possibly the best Governor the Cape ever had—for trying to federalise South Africa, the very thing we are endeavouring to do ourselves? What are we to say of the measures taken by Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Froude to effect that federalisation—measures which were certain to rub up the Colonists to the greatest degree? What can we think of the insistence by the Colonial Office—or was it the Foreign Office?—that the Orange Free State should be separated from the English Crown and given its independence, when it begged to be retained. What can Natal think of the refusal of the British Government to buy Delagoa Bay for a comparatively small sum of money, and at a time when no one in Europe would have objected? What can they think, also, of the refusal of the Colonial Office to take steps to prevent a settlement of Germans in West Africa? What can they think when they remember that it was owing to Mr. Cecil Rhodes that Germany did not acquire a strip of territory right across South Africa which would have prevented the development of that country under British influence, and the completion of that railway from Cairo to the Cape which was the dream of Mr. Rhodes? I do not refer to these things in order to revive extinct controversies, but to show how much reason we have to be careful in our dealings with South Africa.

Looking back upon it in the light of past experience, is there anyone who will deny—there is certainly no one in South Africa who will deny—that ever since the surrender after Majuba Hill a war with the Boers was practically inevitable. I have the less hesitation in saying so because at that time I was one of those who was disposed to think Mr. Gladstone's Government was right. We did not know, the public did not know, then how deep was the feeling of resentment in the British colonists, who, after the professions of the British Government, had been handed back to the Boers. We did not know the contempt for our courage and consistency that that surrender excited among the Boers themselves. Still less did we know that one of the chief reasons for surrender was the fact that the Government had received letters from President Brand informing them that the Orange Free State were about to join the Transvaal. I was not able to find anyone in South Africa who did not think that what made the late war inevitable were the transactions of 1881 and 1882, and by no means the policy of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner.

To come to the present, it seems almost an impertinence for anyone to add to the words which fell from Lord Milner, for he has had a greater opportunity of knowing the true facts of the case than one in my position can have; but I do not think anyone can travel through South Africa without seeing that responsible Government for the Orange River Colony means the handing over of that Colony completely, under existing circumstances, to Dutch influence. It means abandoning all control over the schools and converting them into hotbeds of sedition and propaganda of Dutch as against English ideas. It means the abandonment of any control over the importation of arms, and it means putting the English farmers and settlers in a most precarious and dangerous position.

There is a Member of your Lordship's House—a noble Duke—who, I believe at the suggestion of Lord Milner, has invested a very large sum of money in making it possible for English farmers to settle in the Orange River Colony and to farm the land. Much has been done in the same way by the Land Settlement Commission under the auspices of the South African Government. Do you think those farmers will be grateful for the creation of a state of things which will make their position difficult and precarious? Do you think it will encourage others to settle in the Orange River Colony and in the Transvaal? Yet, my Lords, if there was one thing more true than another in what fell from the noble Viscount last night, it was the statement that the key to the future situation of South Africa is to be found in the creation of a strong English influence in the Orange River Colony and in the Transvaal to counterbalance Dutch sympathies, and, I am sorry to add, the prevailing disloyalty of Cape Colony.

I do not wish to be accused of bitterness, but the truth must be spoken, Lord Roberts has already alluded to it. There is great disloyalty among the Dutch population, and can we be surprised at it? If I were a Boer I should not be conciliated at the present time. Why should I? You are not going to conciliate Boers by concession; you will conciliate them by continuous good government. They are quite clever enough to know that good government means their own prosperity; but you will not conciliate them now or at once, and you will conciliate them least of all by encouraging them to think that the British Government cannot be of the same mind for more than five years together, and allowing them to suppose that they have only to set one Party against the other to get what they want. At this moment I do not know to what extent, but to some extent at all events, the Boer leaders are making speeches about Chinese labour. Does anyone in this House suppose that the Boer leaders care anything about slavery, or about the condition of the Chinese? They are perfectly indifferent to servile conditions, to slavery pure and simple; but they are slim enough to know that Chinese labour is a convenient instrument to force prematurely the giving of responsible Government, through which they hope they may be enabled to gain by the ballot box what they have not succeeded in obtaining through the war.

What makes the situation more serious —and I do venture very earnestly to impress upon His Majesty's Government the necessity of very carefullyconsidering the steps they are about to take—is the fact that things in South Africa are improving. There is a better feeling; there is great hostility, but it is diminishing. The noble Viscount who introduced this subject to your Lordships last night has laid the foundations well and wisely, and Lord Selborne is building on those foundations well and wisely. I had occasion a very short time ago to trek from Mafeking to Pretoria, a five days journey, and it happened to be almost immediately after Lord Selborne had been making a tour of that part of the country. It was pleasant to English ears, and it was specially pleasant to the ears of a friend of Lord Selborne's, to hear what was said of him and the admirable work he was doing in that country. No one had any object in saying what they did not think to a simple traveller like myself; but it was the universal opinion that England could have sent out no better representative than Lord Selborne; and it was also the universal conviction that if only things could be left alone, and South Africa could be excluded from these miserable Party quarrels, a brighter day was dawning for South Africa, and there was a hope, at not too distant a future, of the conciliation of the English and Dutch elements throughout the country.

One word in conclusion. Lord Milner has been made the subject of violent attack. The noble Viscount is perfectly able to take care of himself, but as one who has tried to inform his mind and who has recently come back from South Africa I wish, on this occasion, to express my sense of the profound debt of gratitude this country owes to Lord Milner. When he went out to South Africa he had the intelligence to see what was at stake, and he had the courage and the resolution, in the face of much obloquy and much personal attack, to see that what was essential for the security of the Empire was attained. Though Lord Milner and Mr. Chamberlain are more than competent to take care of themselves, there are others whose homes are not in this country, and who are not here, who are also made the subject of violent attack. Only the other day in the other House of Parliament these men were called bloodthirsty moneygrubbers and were accused of having engendered the war. My Lords, let me tell you—Lord Roberts has already alluded to the subject—who some of these men are. They are the inhabitants of Johannesburg, they are those who raised, and many of them formed part of, that gallant regiment, of which the noble and gallant Earl on the Cross Benches has spoken—the Imperial Light Horse. Let me repeat what fell from Lord Roberts. Outside Ladysmith, on Wagon Hill, there is a monument put up by their comrades to those members of that regiment who fell on that memorable

Viscount Halifax.

6th of January. The words of the inscription are—

> "Tell England, ye who pass this monument, that we who died serving her rest here content."

My Lords, they were content to die, and Englishmen in Parliament are content to call them bloodthirsty money-grubbers. I pray that we in England may not be unworthy of those whose graves are to be found far and wide throughout South Africa, but that we may put Party spirit aside, and with one consent think only of that which is for the real welfare of South Africa, for the extension of the British Empire, and for the honour of the British name.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, it seems to me that throughout the whole of this debate there has been a strange air of unreality. What is the course followed by noble Lords opposite? Questions are asked and then they are going, I suppose, to run away from their Questions. If even half the things said against us on this side by noble Lords opposite were true, they ought, in common decency, to have the courage of their convictions, and take the opinion of the House upon the question. Why do they not do that? They do not do it because they know that it would only emphasise the ineffectual strength of their majority here as compared with their insignificant minority in another place and in the country.

The noble Viscount who has just spoken has in the most categorical way, and I am perfectly certain that he was speaking what he believed to be true, told your lordships that he had made inquiries from various responsible persons and from various responsible sources, and that he could not himself discover that the Chinese coolies had been subjected to any ill-usage at all. In the course of my remarks I am not going to make general charges or general statements, but to prove by the Blue-books, which I do not think my noble friend can have seen, that abuses of a very strong and grave kind have existed under this Ordinance. The noble Duke on the Front Bench opposite informed the House, I understood, that he had in his possession various very disgraceful cartoons on the subject of Chinese labour. I have spoken on many platforms, I have attended a great number of public meetings, but I do not happen to have seen those cartoons myself, and, therefore, I cannot speak about them; but it is really idle to say that this feeling against Chinese labour was created by any extravagant cartoons.

I do not think that your Lordships have sufficiently appreciated the very strong feeling that has existed, and still exists, in the minds of the majority of our fellow-countrymen against this Chinese labour. Reference has been made to Mr. Chamberlain. The Chinese cartoons evidently did not have any effect in Birmingham. Mr. Chamberlain has survived them, and he is, perhaps, the only great and distinguished Minister on the other side of the House who it can be justly said has a great democracy behind him. What is Mr. Chamberlain's feeling as regards this Question of Chinese labour? Mr. Chamberlain said only quite recently in the other House—

> "I for one am inclined to think that a good number of the votes—it is impossible to say what proportion — were undoubtedly given during the election upon this question—were given, not induced by the posters and pamphlets of which we have heard so much, but by sympathy with the view that this was the first step, or at all events a very important step, for introducing cheap competition with British labour."

And Mr. Chamberlain himself, in the course of the same speech, went on to say—

> "I do not believe that Chinese labour is desirable in the mines of the Transvaal. I think that it may be necessary — I should certainly hold that that was not disproved—but, on the other hand, I say a perfectly reasonable man, bringing honesty and intelligence to bear on the subject, may very fairly take the other view."

We cannot forget that it is imbued in the minds of our fellow-countrymen that this question of Chinese labour is not a mere domestic question confined to the Transvaal, but that if the principle is to be admitted in one portion of His Majesty's dominions it may be applied elsewhere. What did the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) say with regard to that? A debate took place in this House on March 18th, 1904, initiated by my noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge. In the course of that debate the noble Duke said—

> "If an employer in this country was anxious to secure the services of foreigners under a system of contract no objection could be taken. Why should the thing be inherently wrong when the employer is in South Africa and the employee is a Chinaman? If the industry had been cotton or wheat growing, no one would have said that the demand for labour was based on morally bad principles, but because the individual concerned is yellow and the industry is gold-mining, a prejudice is created, not against the principle itself, but against the nationality of the individual and the nature of his work."

Now, I think if that extract from the noble Duke's speech had been, and perhaps it was, published in the form of a pamphlet, it is quite sufficient reason for the Conservative Party losing every county seat in the county of Oxfordshire. The noble Duke, speaking on behalf of the late Government, admitted that in their opinion alien labour, labour under the same conditions as exist under this Ordinance, might be and could be perfectly defensibly introduced into this country and applied not only to mining but to agriculture. That follows from the noble Duke's statement, and that is precisely what the people of this country felt in regard to it. They felt that it was not entirely a domestic question, and that if it was to be applicable to one portion of His Majesty's dominions it might be applicable to another.

But, my Lords, there is a further very grave objection to this Ordinance. We find it stated in the Blue-books that these Chinese coolies were defrauded of their proper wages under the Ordinance. I refer to a despatch from Sir Somers Vine to the Governor, from Johannesburg, under date October 28th, 1905. This is very important, because in another place there were long and frequent discussions as to securing that the pay of the coolies should be proper and adequate. Let me quote from this despatch—

> "The Labour Importation Ordinance, 1904, Form I., Contract of Service, Section 6, reads as follows:—'If, however, within six months from the date of the said labourers' arrival in the Witswatersrand district the average pay of the labourers employed by the said employer under the said Ordinance does not equal 50s. for thirty working days, the rate should be increased from 1s. to 1s. 6d. for each working day of ten hours.' According to the above Contract of Service the wages of the first batch of 601 coolies on day pay who arrived at the mine at the end of September last year should have been raised in April, 1905; the wages of the second and third batches of 1,711 coolies on day pay who arrived approximately during the last week in November, 1904, should have been increased in June, 1905; and, finally, the wages of the last batch of 746 coolies on day pay who arrived at the mine on January 2nd and 3rd ought to have been raised in July, 1905. But no rise in wages was made on any of the above dates, and the average pay of the labourers was far below 1s. 8d. at the end of June, 1905. The first batch of coolies, whose wages were due to be raised during April, advanced reiterated complaints to the effect that the mine was not paying to them the rate of wages as per term of contract. I wrote to this effect to the mine secretary on May 26th, 1905. I received an answer from him on the same day stating with reference 'to the increase of wages he (the Secretary) had arranged with the general manager to go into the matter at once.' Unfortunately, however, this matter, as far as my knowledge goes, was never taken into consideration."

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Will the noble Earl tell us what Paper he is quoting from?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I am quoting from Cd. 2,788, pages 49 and 50.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Last year's Blue-book?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Yes. Sir Somers Vine goes on in the same despatch to say that the neglect on the part of the management to make good just complaints advanced by the coolies through him made his position as compound manager most undesirable and untenable, and it was owing to this that he felt compelled to resign. Now, my Lords, let us examine what is contained in these Blue-books respecting the ill-usage of the coolies. The first despatch to which I would refer is dated March 5th, 1904, from the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office. A question was arising then between our Government and the Chinese Minister respecting the protection of the Chinese coolies against possible rough usage. The despatch proceeds—

> "Mr. Lyttelton telegraphed to Lord Milner upon the five points especially referred to by the Chinese Minister. As regards the first of these points, Lord Milner replied that the proposal that the Consul or Consular Agent of the country of the immigrant shall have power to visit the mines and make representations to the authorities respecting the well-being of the

immigrant, is open to strong objection. He pointed out that the Transvaal Government is appointing a special officer as protector of indentured labourers, in whose hands their interests will be safe."

The person appointed was a Mr. Evans. I should like to remind your Lordships that while this correspondence was going on between the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office, questions were constantly being asked in another place respecting the ill-usage of the coolies. Mr. Swift MacNeill asked the Secretary of State whether the refractory coolies were flogged and what they were flogged with, and the Secretary of State replied—

> "There are no cat-o'-nine-tails. The maximum of strokes inflicted with the cane, which is the instrument of whipping, would be twenty-four. The whipping would be given in the presence of the Governor or deputy-Governor of the prison, the gaoler, and the visiting medical officer, who certifies to the fitness of the prisoner to undergo the punishment. The sentence being by a magistrate cannot be carried out until the record has been sent to, and confirmed by, a Judge of the High Court."

The noble Duke opposite, in perfect good faith of course, made a statement on July 20th, 1905, in reply to a question asked by my noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge, to the effect that the Secretary of State had frequently declared that he would be willing to inquire into any specific case of illegal flogging, but that he had not yet been able to verify any. Questions were being asked in Parliament, and the representatives of His Majesty's Government, I have no doubt in perfect good faith, assured Parliament that no illegal flogging was taking place. Now, what was really going on? A most remarkable telegram appears in the Blue-book from Mr. Lyttelton to Governor the Earl of Selborne, and in this despatch Mr. Lyttelton says—

> "At the end of August"—

I would ask your Lordships to note that that is after Parliament had risen—

> "I received from you a statement as to an arrangement which Mr. Evans, the late superintendent of foreign labour, had made on his own responsibility. There appears to be no record of this arrangement, and I accordingly referred to Mr. Evans for his account of it. He states that, realising as he did the impossibility of personally inquiring into every trivial offence, and the desirability of allowing a compound manager some authority over the men for whose order he was responsible, he informed the mine managers that in cases of breaches of discipline and trivial offences for which it was not considered necessary to prosecute, he would not interfere if slight corporal punishment . . . . was administered."

Mr. Evans goes on to say—and this is, I confess, a most astounding statement—

> "He (Mr. Evans) informed Lord Milner of his action, and Lord Milner took no objection."

The noble Viscount is in the House, and I hope he will be able to make some statement in regard to this. Mr. Evans, the superintendent who was appointed to look after the Chinese, is stated in this telegram of Mr. Lyttelton's to Lord Selborne, to have instituted an illegal system of flogging, and we are told that he informed Lord Milner of his action, and that Lord Milner took no objection. I should like to ask the noble Viscount whether that is true or not.

VISCOUNT MILNER: I do not know whether I shall be in order in replying to the noble Earl now, but the matter has been called attention to in another place, and I think it might be convenient if I were to state exactly my recollection. It is no doubt true that I was informed by the superintendent of foreign labour—an official whose services had been placed at the disposal of the Transvaal Government by the Home Government because of his long experience in a Colony where Chinese coolie labour was the rule—that he had found it necessary to allow the infliction of corporal punishment on the mines in certain cases. I understood from him that the punishment inflicted was of the nature of caning, that it was never inflicted for offences such as desertion or refusal to work, or anything of that kind, but only for acts of violence and disturbance to order which it was thought necessary, even in the interests of the coolies themselves, promptly to repress, and that he was confident that it was within the power of himself and his staff to prevent any abuses. That being the view of the man who was appointed to protect the interests of the coolies, and whom, I may say, I had found on every occaion to be fearlessly zealous and devoted in the defence of their interests, I did not interfere. I fully recognised that I took upon myself the whole responsibility. I think, in the light of subsequent events, that I was wrong, because, whatever the drawbacks might have been of not having prompt repression of such offences, abuses might arise from allowing the punishment in any case. This was immediately before I left the Transvaal. Shortly after I had left the Lieutenant-Governor heard reports that on one or two mines ill-treatment of coolies had taken place, and he immediately prevented all corporal punishment whatever at any of the mines. If I had been there I should have done the same.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: The noble Viscount has made a long statement in reply to a direct question, but he has admitted that he sanctioned illegal flogging. I should like also to recall this point in connection with that. I would ask your Lordships' attention to a despatch from the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office under date March 5th, 1904. To quote from this despatch—

> "With regard to the second point raised by the Chinese Minister relating to corporal punishment, Lord Milner pointed out that any labourers imported would be amenable to the law of the land, by which everybody, including whites, is liable to corporal punishment for certain offences, but no corporal punishment would be allowed except for such offences, and in these cases would only be inflicted after trial and sentence by a magistrate or judge."

I maintain that it is a monstrous thing for the Lord High Commissioner to make a statement of that kind, to deal in that way with the Chinese Minister, and then to sanction illegal flogging. I rejoice that my right hon. friend the late Secretary of State for the Colonies did not for one moment allow his mind to draw a distinction between what is called slight corporal punishment and flogging, for in the telegram from Mr. Lyttelton to Lord Selborne which I have already quoted Mr. Lyttelton goes on to say—

> "I profoundly regret that corporal punishment, however slight, was authorised without the safeguards of the law, and that the matter was not brought to my notice as Secretary of State before it was authorised. Mr. Evans appears to have held that it was possible to draw distinction"—

As indeed the noble Viscount has attempted to do—

> "between slight corporal punishment for disciplinary purposes and flogging, for which the Government was bound to prosecute if brought to its notice. Such a distinction cannot be maintained."

After all, what is this slight corporal punishment to which the noble Viscount refers? Lord Selborne, in a despatch to Mr. Lyttelton, dated December 9th, 1905, said—

> "Now it is not denied, and indeed I have already informed you, that prior to June, 1905, illegal corporal punishment after trial by the mine authorities was widely resorted to as a disciplinary measure on the mines of the Witwatersrand; and it cannot be disputed that where administered it was administered in the manner described in Mr. Boland's letter."

Now, my Lords, what is the manner described by Mr. Boland in his letter, of the punishment for which Lord Milner is responsible. I will read it. It describes the method of procedure in laying on the punishment—

> "A coolie is reported either by a white shift boss or by a headman for an offence. He is called into the compound manager's office, charged, and given a fair trial (except where the compound manager does not know the Chinese language and has to trust to his yellow interpreter). Then the sentence is passed by the compound manager—ten, fifteen, or twenty strokes, according to the crime. The coolie, with a Chinese policeman on either side of him, is taken away about ten paces. Then he stops, and at the word of a policeman, drops his pantaloons, and falls flat on his face and at full length on the floor. One policeman holds his feet together; another, with both hands pressed firmly on the back of his head, looks after that end of his body. Then the flagellator, with a strip of thick leather on the end of a 3 ft. wooden handle, lays on the punishment, severely or lightly, as instructed. Should the prisoner struggle after the first few strokes, another policeman plants a foot in the middle of his back until the full dose has been administered."

That is the kind of abuse which went on under the Ordinance, illegal flogging which, we are now told, received the sanction of the High Commissioner. I must apologise to the House for the necessity of reading so many extracts, but in a matter of this kind one cannot be too careful or exact in substantiating as one proceeds each and every step, and it is in the Blue-books themselves that the strongest condemnation of the Chinese Ordinance is to be found.

These Blue-books justify the feeling in this country and our predictions when in opposition. The conditions under this Ordinance, whether you call them slavery, or, as the Prime Minister did on March 21st, 1904, in another place, so like slavery that they are almost indistinguishable, do differ fundamentally from those in every other Ordinance of indentured labour in their denial to the labourer of all rights of citzenship, of all that is essential to human progress as well as to personal liberty. I cannot congratulate the Opposition on being very valiant. Why do they ask questions and then run away? But be that as it may, we have no occasion to resent this debate. It has enabled us to clear up what the noble Viscount described as the paralysing uncertainty of the financial position in the Transvaal. It has afforded us an opportunity of declaring that we will, neither directly nor indirectly, under any circumstances, acquiesce in the acceptance, for an indefinite time, of this Ordinance, but that, so long as we are responsible for the conduct of affairs, any Colonial legislation corresponding to that of this Ordinance and inconsistent with our best British traditions, would unquestionably be vetoed, not only by the inherent power invested in the Crown, but by express instructions given to the governor.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, before I deal with the matters under discussion, I should like to express my dissent from the view of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War that there is any air of unreality about the debate. The noble Earl denounced the Members of your Lordships' House on this side for having started a debate upon which they were afraid to divide the House. The noble Earl has sat on various sides of your Lordships' House, but this is the first time he has occupied a seat on the Front Government Bench. I venture to think that if he had had a longer Governmental experience he would have known that it is not usual to divide the House on a question as to matters of fact such as that brought forward by the noble Viscount who introduced the debate.

I think there is no one in your Lordships' House who will contradict me when I say that the debate which has taken place has been not only most interesting and instructive, but most important. The questions raised by the noble Viscount are undoubtedly of enormous importance. The noble Viscount speaks not only with a sense of responsibility, but with a practical knowledge of the affairs of South Africa which in my opinion no one else possesses. He ventured with perfect justice to warn your Lordships of the state of affairs that might follow if the policy which he advocated, and which was supported by the Government of which I was a member, is not carried out. He spoke those weighty words of warning to His Majesty's Government because he believed that if they departed from the policy which he had pursued there might be absolute ruin in South Africa. It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to drive home the arguments which were put forward so ably and eloquently by the noble Viscount; but at least I can express a hope that His Majesty's Government will take to heart the opinions he laid before them and will not enter into any rash or ill-considered policy in regard to South Africa. Any such policy would destroy for ever the results achieved in recent years in South Africa by the blood of those who died in the war, and South Africa would go back to the condition in which it was after Majuba.

My object in rising is not to address myself to the question of the future Constitution of the Transvaal. I leave that to those with more practical knowledge. In regard to the subject of Chinese labour there cannot be the slightest question that both before and during the general election misrepresentation was rampant in the constituencies. The noble Lord who spoke first this evening declared that the Conservative Party must have a very poor case if they were defeated on account of the exaggerated statements made in regard to Chinese labour. May I say that I hope the Conservative Party will always have a poor case rather than deviate from the path of truth? I would rather see the Conservative Party in opposition for the rest of its existence than that we should return to power through misrepresentation. It cannot be denied that there was gross misrepresentation on this subject. Now, when the election is over and it is a little late to do it, members of the Government show the greatest anxiety, whenever opportunity occurs, to dissociate themselves from the use of the word "slavery."

It is curious to note the particular way in which leading members of the Government dissociate themselves from this now somewhat unpopular word. With the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council it is only "a descriptive term"; the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister alludes to it now as "servile conditions," while the Under-Secretary for the Colonies uses the most remarkable expression "terminological inexactitude." But the strongest repudiation came from the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he stated yesterday that he deeply regretted that the term had been used. I would like to ask whether Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman concurs with the noble Earl in that expression of regret, and whether the supporters of His Majesty's Government who sit below the gangway in the House of Commons, headed by Dr. Macnamara, also regret the use of the term, or whether they adhere to the word "slavery" or the Prime Minister's phrase of "taint of slavery."

What, I would like to ask, is going to be the future of Chinese labour in South Africa? We have had no definite statement on that question from any member of His Majesty's Government either in this House or in another place, and I think we are entitled to have a declaration on the subject from a member of the Government before the debate closes. I find it very difficult indeed to reconcile the statements of the Under-Secretary and those of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to what the future of Chinese labour in South Africa is to be; and I am certainly at a loss to reconcile the speeches which were made in opposition by the Under-Secretary with the speech he delivered the other day in the House of Commons. In the extract which I am about to read occurs the name of Sir Edward Grey, and may I say with what respect and affection Lady Grey was held by all who knew her and how deeply we sympathise with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his great bereavement? Speaking at Manchester, I think in October, the Under Secretary for the Colonies said—

> "He thanked Sir Edward Grey for his outspoken statement on Chinese labour. It was clear from that declaration that should a Liberal majority result from the next election the importation of Chinamen into South Africa would cease, and that meant that within three years the whole of the yellow coolies employed on the Rand would be repatriated to their own country."

That, I thought, was a remarkable statement, and it seems to me that it would require a large sum of money to repatriate all these people. It would be well to ask at whose expense they were to be repatriated. To my amazement I read the following statement made by the Under-Secretary in the debate in the House of Commons—

> "He could not doubt that a sudden arbitrary deportation of one-third of the labour supply in South Africa would produce an utter economic collapse."

It is impossible to reconcile the two speeches. No doubt the Under-Secretary as an independent Member addressing a vast Lancashire audience said more than he meant. But I hope some noble Lord on the Front Bench opposite will inform us how it is possible to reconcile these two statements. I think myself it would have been fairer if the present Prime Minister had ascertained the position of Chinese labour before leading the country to believe that the Liberal Party were pledged to recall this Ordinance.

The supporters of His Majesty's Government have described Chinese labour as "slavery." If it were so, is not almost every other civilised Power practically open to the same charge? I think the Government are realising that they went a little too far in the statements they made when they were a free people in opposition. Labour is absolutely necessary in South Africa, and no other labour can be found. Are His Majesty's Government going to allow the country to be impoverished simply because they will not permit the employment of a certain class of labour willing to do the work? The resources of South Africa are very great, and it is only by developing those resources that in future we can obtain any return for the vast sums of money that have been expended on the country. The labour question is a difficult one. I am myself a large employer of labour, and I know full well that the easier it is to obtain labour the cheaper is the cost of production and the cheaper the price at which the articles can be sold. My noble friend Lord Harris dealt with this question last night, and put to the noble Earl the Secretary of State a question which he did not answer, but which I think should be answered to-night. Lord Harris asked whether the Government, in order to be consistent, would interfere with the recruiting of Kaffirs from Portuguese territory. He pointed out that the Portuguese Government had recently stipulated that they would only allow the recruiting of Kaffirs in Portuguese territory on condition that at the end of their engagement the Kaffirs should be returned and should not be allowed to take up other work in the Transvaal. I hope that an Answer will be given to Lord Harris' Question before the debate concludes.

The general impression created in this country by speakers who denounced Chinese labour was that the compounds in the Transvaal were merely wretched palings, that they resembled the village pound in which a strange donkey is occasionally imprisoned. I read in the *Saturday Review* yesterday—

> "The compound system was started some thirty years ago by the owners of the De Beers Mines, and nobody saw any harm in it until the other day, though the rigour of the De Beers regulations is far worse than anything the Chinese are subjected to. It is impossible to see any distinction in principle between importing coolies from China and in importing natives from Portuguese South Africa."

Those statements I believe are perfectly correct. On this question my mind goes back to the speech of the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture, who waxed very warm in his denunciation of the compounds in which the Chinese were to be confined. Why was it, I ask, that the noble Earl, who complained so loudly of the compound system in the Transvaal in 1905, did not complain of the compounds at the De Beers Mines which he himself visited in 1901 and where the regulations are far more stringent? The fact is, these allegations were nothing but a Party cry for the general election. I should like to ask the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, like his noble friend, Lord Elgin, he regrets the allegation, or whether he adheres to what he said last year. I repeat that these allegations were nothing but a Party cry for the general election. Noble Lords opposite will find out—indeed they are already finding out—that it is a rash thing while in opposition to make promises and raise hopes that cannot possibly be realised. This is not the first time that England has been roused by the cry of cruelty for political purposes before a general election. In 1880 Mr. Gladstone won the general election on the Bulgarian atrocities cry. But the country afterwards realised what a victory of that kind meant, and the Chinese slavery cry will also be found out. These misrepresentations will recoil upon their authors, but in the meantime the Unionist party will not allow them to remain unanswered. I hope that my noble friend Lord Harris will raise this question again and again in your Lordships' House, and however unworthy I may be to do so he will always find me ready to follow him.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I understand, so far as I can gather from this debate, that the object of this debate is educational rather than constructive, and the method has been more by way of criticism than by way of suggestion. A noble Lord who sits on a back bench on the Opposition side made a speech in reference to the relations of this country with South Africa a short time ago, and I hope it will not be considered an impertinence on the part of a new comer like myself if I express my admiration of that speech, and also, although I do not concur with all of it, my concurrence with a good deal of it.

No doubt when speaking of history he was right in saying that strange blunders are apparent as we survey the relations between this country and South Africa during the last 100 years. That is a proposition that will have general assent But the noble Viscount left the story half told; and I must say—I think I should be wanting in self-respect if I did not say—that, in my opinion, in this long series of blunders there never was a greater blunder than the policy of the noble Viscount which led to the war. It is not that I speak with any personal feeling whatever in regard either to himself or his motives. The noble Viscount spoke as if those who dissent from his views were men who were enemies of their country—pro-Boers; friends of those who were enemies of their country. For my part, I am wholly indifferent, and I think myself that those of us who most unjustly sustained that imputation coupled with ostracism, five years ago, may look with some satisfaction now to this—that the feeling of our countrymen is that, whatever they may think in regard to our wisdom, we acted with no unworthy motive. My own experience, after twenty-five or twenty-six years in the other House and with knowledge of a great many statesmen and leading men who have distinguished themselves in the service of the State is, that although they have made what may be thought mistakes, I have never known one who did not desire to serve his country sincerely. The noble Viscount has not, I think, been much concerned in Parliamentary affairs or he would not so lightly have adopted the shallow creed that men who differ from each other politically are not equally honourable.

Now, this debate has been somewhat desultory and has covered a large field, but I will advert to two subjects only. The first is Chinese labour. I have always thought that Chinese labour was an ill-advised proceeding from the commencement, and from an economic point of view equally so. The people over the West of Europe have by a succession of generations of sacrifice and suffering gained a standard of living commonly called a living wage, and it means that they have succeeded in obtaining for themselves what may justly be called a position consistent with the dignity of labour. Now, when there are all kinds of facilities for the influx of Oriental races, what would happen if there were an invasion of the West by yellow or coloured labour on a large scale? Think for a moment what would happen it there were an attempt to introduce 50,000 or 60,000 Chinese into this country to compete with the standard of living that has been reached after the endeavours of generations of labour. It would not be tolerated in this country for a moment. All this sophistry, if I may say so, would be swept away instantly, and in no part of Europe would cheap Chinese labour be allowed to compete with white labour; it would not be tolerated.

I admit fully that this was a consideration that operated materially in the course of the late election, as I think Mr. Chamberlain said. The number of white men in the Transvaal is, I understand, something like 120,000, and into this is poured something like 60,000 Chinese against the wishes of Australia and against the view, twice expressed by a unanimous vote, of both Houses in Cape Colony, against the wish of New Zealand, against the opinion of Mr. Chamberlain, and against the unanimous protests of Liberals in both Houses of Parliament. Certainly there should be continuity of policy, so far as the policy is a right one and can be continued, and even to some extent, though it may be wrong, it may be desirable to continue it But this postulates that those who are in power in declaring their policy shall not stand to the ultimate edge of their extreme rights, and shall not use, as they did in the last Parliament, the whole weight of their majority to crush even remonstrance. That is not the way to secure continuity of policy, I submit. The way to secure it is to take into consideration fairly, to weigh and to respect, the opinions of your countrymen, even though you dissent from them.

In the circumstances Chinese labour had not a very hopeful commencement. It had necessarily to be introduced, having regard to Transvaal opinion, under terms of restriction contained in the Ordinance of 1904, some of which applied to service in this country would be bad in law, because, contrary to public policy, they are in restraint of industry and legitimate trade. These things necessarily led to difficulties. The coolies escaped from the compounds, and deputations of Dutch and British represented to Sir A. Lawley that a state of absolute terror existed in districts near Johannesburg owing to foul and horrid outrages committed by these escaped coolies. Is it possible to suppose that the people of the country would be favourable to a state of things exposing them to terror by day and night?

Another evil of a worse kind arising from this unnatural condition of labour is the tendency towards abuse and illegality. We heard only to-night an illustration. The noble Viscount was asked whether he had sanctioned illegal flogging or corporal punishment.

VISCOUNT MILNER: Not flogging.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: And he said he had given his sanction. My recollection of the despatch in the Blue-book is that it was stated that it was impossible to maintain the distinction laid down by Mr. Evans between mild and severe corporal punishment. It was a flagrant illegality. I am quite satisfied of that, though I have no desire in the least to attack the noble Viscount. I have no doubt he had anxious responsibilities, and has no doubt some anxious reflections, but it is the fact that it was illegal, and it must be owned that he knew it. When I had the honour of acting for this country in the Venezuela Arbitration I remember the President of the United States, in answer to some observation, saying—

> The greatness of England and her high estate in the world does not depend on Waterloo or Trafalgar, but on the administration of English justice all the world over."

Is it English justice when illegal punishments are sanctioned by the chief officer of the State? Mr. Lyttelton did, in fact, complain of this; in his despatch he said that during last Session he had been asked Questions, and had answered them as a man of honour and man of spirit, as did also the noble Duke representing the Colonial Office in this House, denying in perfect good faith the existence of illegal punishment. In the despatch of October, 1905, Mr. Lyttelton strongly complained that he was only informed of this illegality at the end of August, 1905.

I come now briefly to remind your Lordships of what happened when that illegal punishment was put an end to, as it was in June, 1905, by Sir Arthur Lawley. A new Ordinance was introduced, giving sanction to trials by new judges—special judges, superintendents, and inspectors—who were appointed in order to protect the interests of the labourers. There may be good in that, I do not wish to offer hostile criticism of them, because they knew the Chinese, and it may be that there was a corresponding advantage; but where were they to try? They were authorised to try in the mines without any publicity. It is quite true their sentences were subject to review, the higher sentences were to be reviewed by the Supreme Court, and the lower, I think, by the Attorney-General. But it was a secret court on private premises; that is a thing unknown in the laws of England, as far as I know. Beyond that there was not only a court, but a prison to be kept in the mine—a lock-up. Then there were the collective fines, and the fine and imprisonment for any fraud or deception in the performance of work, in other words, for scamping. In addition to that—covering all that—is the illegality of the severe punishments described by Mr. Boland, which Lord Selborne stated in his despatch, I think, was "widely resorted to."

The noble Lord asked me if I approved of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's description. I do, with all my heart. I say it was perfectly justified. There was a state of semi-slavery. In that I agree also with what the noble Marquess said who leads us in this House. I pass from that, and ask what are we to do? The noble Marquess indicated some doubt about our declarations. The first thing we said was there could be no more licences granted. The next thing was that we would cause to be altered the punitive and judicial portions of these Ordinances, which offended against natural equity. We also said that we would be prepared, at the expense of this country, to repatriate those who wished to return, not in breach of any contract, as the noble Lord who spoke second in this debate said, because by the terms of their contract they were entitled, upon the payment of their fares there and back, to return. All we said was that they should not be prevented from going back by want of means. I have answered the questions put to me as far as I can recall them. I have no doubt there will be other opportunities of answering inquiries.

And now I have come to the last part of the subject with which I wish to deal, and that is the Constitution. We were warned in solemn tones by the noble Viscount of the dangers there were before us. Yes, there are dangers; such has been, as I think, the unfortunate policy of him, and of those who acted with him, that the path is strewn by dangers. There are dangers, and he is one of the main authors of the dangers. All we have to do is to choose the path which offers least danger and the best hope for our country, if he will credit that any one who really differs from him in his opinion really loves his country. You have a country which has been overborne by the consequences of war, in which all the agricultural capital is destroyed—I am speaking from a despatch—in which most of the country is a wilderness, and there are trials and difficulties of all kinds. The country is endeavouring to pull itself together. You have at present Crown colony government. That is one alternative. Does any noble Lord think that they will long be content with Crown colony government in the Transvaal? It was given up by the late Government, on the ground—I am sure noble Lords will think I am putting it tenderly—that they felt that the pressure on the part of the population was so great that it could not, with propriety, be perpetuated. Broadly, Crown colony government is hopeless. But I understand it to be suggested that we should continue to act as a kind of Providence to the people of the Transvaal, not letting them govern themselves, but governing them wisely, and so promoting reconciliation and amity in the future.

It comes practically to this, that nobody is an advocate, in spite of the strong feeling there is in this House, of Crown colony government. What is the other thing suggested? Representative government by the Lyttelton Constitution. The difficulty of that, as of all other representative Governments which are not responsible, is that the responsibility falls upon the home Government, and the power of harassing abides with the Colonial Assembly. Let me just put this for one moment, in order that noble Lords may follow what a danger and difficulty there was. You were to have a representative Assembly with five or six nominated members, and thirty to thirty-five elected members. The elected members could do as they pleased; they had an enormous majority. They were not permitted to displace a Minister, or to stop his salary, but they could stop supplies. That was the Constitution of the Lyttelton letters patent. I say that was dangerous in the last degree. It would have created friction far more than anything else; it would have meant three of four years of friction, or disturbance, and then all wise men would have said after there had been an interval in which racial and every kind of feeling would have been exasperated "the thing is hopeless. We must come to a responsible government." Therefore, that remained the only course. Before the war, this country was under some conditions regarding Imperial interference in regard to foreign policy. The right was largely exercised in the year before the war, peace was made, and a promise was given of responsible self-government now, or at some other time soon. That is to say, that after the fight you were to give a greater measure of freedom in the Transvaal than existed before the war itself. That is the net result of what I have always considered and called, and shall always consider and call, one of the greatest blunders of English statesmanship since the time we lost the American colonies.

There is no human being who can suggest an alternative to responsible self-government. It was necessary to postpone for a few months the final cessation of Crown colony government. For the Lyttelton Constitution must not be judged as if it were applicable to responsible self-government. It was not so intended; it was intended for representative government. There is no mention of a second Chamber, either in the Constitution itself, or in the correspondence, so far as I have been able to see, antecedent to the Constitution. That had not been considered. Do your Lordships suppose that that could be considered in the time we have had? We came into office about December 12th; the first Cabinet was held on the 20th, then Christmas came and the general election. How could we in that interval bring forth hot-foot a new Constitution intended to be permanent? It was not possible. One thing to be considered was this question of a second Chamber; and another illustration of the necessity for time, if the critics of the new Ministry would be kind enough to allow us a little time, is found in the question of the inter-colonial councils by which local bodies representing the two colonies are exclusively concerned with the railways, a chief source of revenue, and the police, another enormously important subject in connection with self-government. It is quite obvious that it was necessary to take a little time, in order to consider what should be the permanent form of the constitution we should entrust to the Transvaal.

I do trust your Lordships, unless you are absolutely convinced that we wish to endanger our subjects in British South Africa, will think twice before encouraging in the Transvaal and South Africa generally the idea that we are the enemies of the men there of our own blood. It is not true; we are not likely to do so, but the notion is apt to get through the land if language of that kind is used by men, however sincerely they believe it. I have heard it said that Liberals and the present Ministers are men who are indifferent to the claims of their fellow-countrymen, and that they wish to gerrymander things in favour of the Boers. Nothing of the kind. There is no such feeling in the mind of any person I have ever met in political action during the whole time I have been in public life; there is no such party. This Little England party does not exist except in the imaginations of those who have not studied the facts. We all desire to maintain the greatness of this country. We desire it by different means only because we think the means suggested by our opponents are unwise, and that experience shows them to be unwise. The noble Viscount himself admitted that there was more than one way of dealing fairly with this question; and I can assure your Lordships—I know it of myself and I am sure I can say it for the Government—that there is no desire to be unfair to any section of the community in the Transvaal. We wish to see, and we trust we may live to see, the consolidation of the white races in that country living peacefully and contentedly under the British Crown. We are prepared to do our part, and we are convinced that the only lasting foundation, the only corner-stone for a great and enduring structure, is that of absolute justice.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, perhaps I may preface what I have to say by congratulating the House upon the addition which has just been made to its debates by the noble Lord on the Woolsack. I am not surprised at that speech. For many years I have had the honour and pleasure of the noble Lord's friendship, and I can only say that I cannot imagine anyone better suited to sit where he is now sitting than the noble Lord.

My Lords, some complaint was made, I think, by the noble Lord the Earl of Portsmouth that there had been no form of Motion, and it was suggested that we had avoided, because we were afraid to exhibit the divergence between this and the other House, formulating a Motion which would cause a division. I cannot help thinking that it is a very fortunate circumstance that there is no Motion to be put. I can assure the noble Lord who has just spoken that he is quite mistaken in supposing that there is any general belief, or, indeed, any belief, that either he or any of his colleagues are desirous of doing anything to the injury of South Africa or of this country. That is a delusion into which he has fallen by reason of some words which fell from the noble Viscount, but which—I think I can answer for the noble Viscount—were not directed to him or to any of his colleagues. As to whom they were directed I will say a word in a moment. But the reason why I think it is a fortunate circumstance that we have no definite Motion before us upon which your Lordships might be asked to divide is that I regard this debate as a very serious and solemn warning to those who are now charged with the interests of this country that they should—not indeed in a hurry, as the noble Lord seemed to suppose we were anxious that they should—but that they should deliberate well and carefully, and consider seriously such warnings and evidence as we have had in this House, before arriving at any conclusion as to what constitution is to be given to these colonies.

No one could have listened, I should have thought, without feeling the very serious responsibility which rests upon your Lordships, to the words which fell from the noble Viscount or to the remarks of the noble Earl Lord Roberts to-night when he pointed out the dangers which would be imminent in the event of the Transvaal's being transformed into what is practically an independent Government, with two-thirds of its population in hostility to this country. If war should again break out—and when one speaks of perils it is well to deal plainly, and that is what one means—if war should again break out, I should like to know with what face would any English Party meet the country, which, after such warnings as we have had from the noble Viscount and from Lord Roberts, had given a constitution to that which would be a hostile country, and which had the means of gradually preparing for such a war as it would not be easy for this country to meet?

Although there has been no form of Motion put forward, there have been discussed two or three subjects of very divergent importance. Considering the grave perils which have been pointed out I do not think that the question of what produced the majority at the last general election is of very great importance. The question which I think urgently requires to be considered is—What is now to be done? It is very difficult indeed to resist the temptation of the *argumentum ad homines* when we remember what has been represented as the conduct of affairs in South Africa, and when we find that, having succeeded to power, the Party opposite are unable or unwilling to put right what, if things were as they represented them to be, it would be their bounden duty at once to bring to an end.

I am told that it has been announced in the House of Commons to-day that there is no intention at present to rescind the regulations in the Chinese Labour Ordinance under which the coolies are kept in the precincts of the mines. That is no doubt wise and prudent, but, of course, it is an almost irresistible temptation to us on this side, to-day, to say, "Then you cannot believe the things which have been said"—I do not say which your Lordships said, but which were said on your behalf, and which must have greatly influenced the country in the conclusion at which they arrived. If it were true that slavery existed under the British flag, it was the bounden duty of those who succeeded to power to put an end to it. But they do not believe it; it is not true. And then the noble Earl Lord Portsmouth spoke about its being a proper thing to consider that the people who said it was slavery really believed what they said. It is all very well to be so charitable, but did the people who believed it know anything about it? If they did they could not have believed it, because it is untrue. I must say that I recognise the candour and frankness with which the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies spoke of his regret at the statements which have been made in this respect.

But, my Lords, although I admit that the temptation to the argument against our opponents is almost irresistible, I think the great question is, what is now to be done? I am very glad that noble Lords opposite are not to be tempted, now they are in office, to crystallise the view which they had on the subject, as they might be tempted to do if they were driven to a division. I cannot help feeling that the manner in which this question was dealt with at the election, the cartoons, and so on, is calculated to make one think too little of the real inportance of the question brought before us by the noble Viscount, and I was much surprised that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the just and moderate observations which he made, should have applied himself almost exclusively, if not entirely, to the remarks of Lord Harris. I do not deny that this subject might have been made the subject of another and distinct debate, but the questions which I should have thought most demanded an authoritative statement on the part of the noble Earl were the questions brought forward last night by the noble Viscount Lord Milner, and to-night by my noble friend Lord Halifax. Is it possible to hear those statements without thinking of the enormous importance of what they have pointed out—and pointed out by reason not of vague statements in the newspapers or by correspondents, but of their own knowledge of the real feeling of the country and of the real necessities of the case.

My noble friend on the Woolsack pointed out more than once that the state of things necessary there would be so intolerable in this country that nobody would submit to it. I quite agree with him. It is quite true. But does that prove that they are not necessary there? He spoke as if the condition of the mines and of the dwellers in the Transvaal was the same now as it was originally. I think he forgets that the feeling of the country is now entirely the other way, and what we are asked to do, or what we should be asked to do—not that I believe that noble Lords opposite will affirm it—would be to go entirely against the feeling of the country. All the evidence goes to show that the whole of this industry, and therein is the material prosperity of South Africa, depends on the supply of labour; and one universal piece of evidence is that except by the application of Asiatic labour, which happens to be Chinese labour, you cannot get a sufficient supply. So that the problem is this—whether or not, with the knowledge that there is a possibility of a completely prosperous and contented people, you are to interfere, because it would be inappropriate to the conditions of this country, with the supply of labour, and prevent the development of that which is the sole source of the prosperity of the Transvaal.

That, my Lords, is one of the questions which arise. I confess that it is hardly worthy of the dignity of the discussion of what I have pointed out as the question of real importance in this matter, but it is a mistake to speak of this as "slavery" or "semi-slavery." One would suppose from what one hears that indentured labour was something perfectly new, and that nobody had ever heard of it before. That is a great mistake. Again I do not want to adopt the *argumentum ad homines* that other ordinances have been agreed to not very dissimilar from that which is the subject of debate here. But it is one of the ordinary courses of the events of human life that such labour should be required. Different countries in the initial stages of their existence not only have had, but have actually required indentured labour, and would never have risen to the position they afterwards occupied without it. Therefore, when this particular thing is so denounced in the condition in which South Africa was, one looks to see what it is of which complaint is made.

Now, my Lords, if the Chinese had come without any Ordinance at all and had been hired by the mine-owner, I have a strong suspicion that they would have been under much less restriction, that they would have had much less opportunity of knowing what their contract was, and much less opportunity of insisting upon their rights. Great care has been taken to prevent their being put into such confinement as has been suggested. Indeed, I believe one noble Lord in a previous debate in this House actually used the phrase that the Chinese coolies were kept in cages. That was a little misapprehension. But what are the circumstances of the case? The Chinese are invited to go; the contract is explained to them. I do not understand what my noble friend means when he refers to "the mode" in which they are taken to South Africa, as if they were not perfectly free agents and perfectly well able to understand what they are doing. When they get there they are certainly under some restrictions, but let me say that there has been some ridiculous exaggeration about the infringement of the principles of liberty. It is always a popular thing to refer to the principles of liberty. In this country it is naturally a popular topic. But did my noble and learned friend never read—indeed I know he has read with great diligence—the Merchant Shipping Act; and is he not aware that under that Act if a sailor makes a contract he may be arrested and sent to prison if he refuses to carry out that contract? I can imagine a person saying, "Look here; here is a man who has broken his contract, and you are sending him to prison for so doing." What is the difference? I suppose any reference to "the nature of slavery" would not be justified, but it might be said, "Oh, in reference to sea-going industries you must have some considerable power over persons who engage; there are questions of the safety of life, and so on." But, unfortunately, besides being liable to imprisonment while he is on a voyage, when absolute obedience may be necessary for the safety of life, a sailor may, as I have pointed out, be sent to prison because he refuses to go to sea. What shocking tyranny! What an abominable infringement of the principles of liberty that when a man has entered into a contract you should actually arrest him, and send him to prison because he will not perform his contract! If the question were raised in the Transvaal by those who wanted labour, and we were to interfere with their having that labour, it is not at all impossible that the Merchant Shipping Act might be quoted against us. The last Merchant Shipping Act was, I think, passed in 1894, so that probably my noble and learned friend had something to do with the construction of it.

I do not want to lower the tone of the debate which the noble Viscount has initiated, but let me say one word about a misapprehension which I think was in the mind of the noble Earl Lord Portsmouth. I have heard a great deal on the subject of cartoons. Surely the noble Earl, and also the Secretary of State for the Colonies, must have been remarkably blind during the somewhat lively times of the recent general election not to have seen some of the cartoons to which reference has been made. It is very odd, but, of course, I entirely accept their statement that they did not see them. Most of us, however, saw a considerable number of them. What is complained of is not, I think, the fact that the people took a strong view of the Ordinance itself. But how many of the electors of this country do you suppose have ever read the Ordinance, seen what is in it, or known what is or is not authorised by it? Undoubtedly a very strong prejudice was caused in the public mind. And when one hears about the public verdict having been given on this, that, or the other question, is it unknown to noble Lords opposite that one particular allegation may run through the whole country, and create a very strong prejudice, although there may be not the slightest foundation of truth for it? I think the history of human delusions would contradict such a view.

Now, my Lords, what was it that these placards said? It was not that the Ordinance as it existed was tyranny or slavery, but that the state of things was such that the persons who contrived these cartoons and placards and distributed them broadcast in every part of the Kingdom declared there was actual slavery, that people were actually in chains, and that they were actually being driven by slave-drivers with whips and thus made to perform their work. That was the allegation made, and that allegation undoubtedly, so far as the placards were concerned, was perfectly true. I do not understand, therefore, what the noble Earl means by saying that people may take different views of what the Ordinance said, that it was said to be slavery, and that a great many people believed it to be slavery. Yes, they did, because they had not read the Ordinance, and because there was a persistent desire to misrepresent what the Ordinance said, and a great many ignorant people were misled by those statements—mere statements of fact as they were presumed to be—into doing injustice to their fellow countrymen.

But it is not only a question of the effect upon the voters and the possibility of their having been misled; the question was, and is, what has been the effect of this in South Africa? There are those who are certainly disposed to make mischief between the mother country and the Colonies in South Africa. I do not want to go back as far as my noble friend did into the question of the war and who caused it. It is enough to say that since Majuba everybody has recognised the fact year after year that war was absolutely certain sooner or later, and as war was inevitable sooner or later it has been the intent and object of a large party in South Africa—in the Cape especially, and elsewhere—that the war should take place under such circumstances as that this country should be defeated.

Now let me point out to my noble friend to whom it was that the observations of the noble Viscount were addressed. They were not addressed to him; they were not addressed, I think, to the Liberal Party generally; but they were addressed to those who are agitating in South Africa at this moment, and whose sole object is to put this country in conflict with her own Colonies. These are the persons to whom the noble Viscount referred, and I must say that in my view anybody who aids and assists the idea that this country is not anxious to do all it can for its own Colonies is aiding and assisting a most mischievous nucleus of conspirators against the liberties, the interests, and the prosperity of the Transvaal.

*LORD STANMORE: My Lords, I do not know that I should have ventured to trouble your Lordships with any remarks this evening had it not been for the fact that I desire strongly, with regard to one part of the subject which has been under discussion, to test the question by a test which has not yet been applied to it, and to show as it has not yet been shown what very large concerns entirely outside the immediate question of South Africa are affected by the subject-matter of the debate.

I cannot but regret that two questions, each of which well deserves the consideration of this House for a whole evening, should have been blended into one, and I think that that blending has led to some slight confusion of thought on the part of certain noble Lords who have addressed the House. The noble Viscount who opened the discussion delivered an elaborate, an eloquent, and a forcible speech, but I cannot say that to my ear it sounded as perfectly dispassionate and impartial as he himself gave it the credit of being. But let that pass. It is not my intention to enter at any length upon the speech of the noble Viscount, but I may make this one remark. It carried me back to the days of my early boyhood. More than sixty years ago I was in the habit of attending the debates in this House, and in those days, in the early forties, I heard the whole of the noble Viscount's speech—every part of it. The doubts and fears with regard to the possible consequences of the step that was to be taken, the passionate appeals not to desert British subjects or put them in a position of inferiority were the same. The encouragement of rebels, the danger which might ensue from the accession to high office of a man who had been in rebellion against the Queen were then as now insisted on—all these things came back to my ear as they had then fallen, not indeed from the noble Viscount, but from Lord Lyndhurst. To be sure, the name of the rebel was then Papineau, and the alien race whose possible injury to the British element in the Colony was deprecated was French, not Dutch, but with those two exceptions the arguments used were almost precisely the same, and the dangers threatened were just those which were indicated last night.

Then, my Lords, there was yet another resemblance between those past debates and that which is now taking place. To-night an illustrious soldier has risen in his place and told us that he should be deserting those who had deserved well of Great Britain if he did not defend their cause, and plead against anything which could diminish British ascendancy in South Africa. So, too, sixty years ago a great soldier—a soldier whose eminence the noble Earl Lord Roberts would be the first to recognise—the Duke of Wellington, treated this House to an exactly similar speech with regard to the loyalists of Canada. Well, my Lords, the Government of that day had the courage to disregard those vaticinations from however illustrious a quarter they came, and I congratulate the present Government on their courage in doing the same now. We all know what happy results have followed that action of a former Government; we all trust, and I for one confidently believe, that similar results will follow the action of the Government of the present day.

That is all I will say with regard to the speech of the noble Viscount Lord Milner, and I will only add a word on the topic to which his speech was chiefly devoted. Another noble Viscount, Lord Halifax, in a very eloquent and interesting speech has given us an account of the state of things which he saw in South Africa. I do not question the accuracy of his eyesight; that it is not the point with which I wish to deal. It is with the noble Viscount's account of the Constitution of the Colony that I wish to deal, and I thank my noble friend Lord Halifax for the, I believe, entirely unintentional support which he gave to the action he was opposing. He gave us a long list of the errors and blunders that had been committed, and he told us how it was that those errors and blunders had been committed. Because we had not taken into account the views of the people of South Africa themselves. That is precisely what the Government now propose to do, and in that long record of blunders made because the Colony was unable to speak its own free will the noble Viscount has put forward the strongest argument that can be adduced in favour of the grant of responsible government to the Transvaal.

But, my Lords, though I think these observations are such as I am entitled to make, I do not think I should have risen merely for the purpose of making them. That which leads me to address your Lordships to-night is the Question put by the noble Lord, Lord Harris. I do not wish to enter into any controversy with him or with any other noble Lord about the details of the Ordinances which have been passed in the Transvaal, whether this or that particular provision is a good or a bad provision, or whether it is one which has been enacted before or not; I am not inclined to enter into those details, at any rate, on this occasion, although my disinclination is not due to any lack of power to do so or any inability to show how entirely inaccurate the noble Lord's view of the matter is.

What I propose to do is this. There are a certain number of fixed general principles which underlie and govern all the older Immigration Ordinances—I believe I may say every Ordinance prior to the Transvaal Immigration Ordinance of 1904. Those principles are laid down in a series of Despatches from successive Secretaries of State, ranging over a period of some fifty or sixty years. The series begins with despatches from the late Lord Grey, some of them addressed to the father of my noble friend Lord Harris, who was one of my predecessors in the Governorship of Trinidad, some addressed to the Governors of Jamaica, of Mauritius, and of other Colonies; they were followed up by despatches of a similar character from the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Kimberley, and the late Lord Derby, and were supplemented by most valuable Reports of the Immigration Commissioners. All those documents laid down certain principles, and by those principles every Ordinance during that long period of years was governed and regulated. All the provisions of those Ordinances are in consonance with those principles.

Now, my Lords, let me enunciate those principles one by one, and see in each case whether the Transvaal Ordinance does or does not comply with them. The first principle laid down by Lord Grey and the Immigration Commissioners was that under no circumstances was immigration of foreign labour to take place unless it was clearly shown to be imperative and rendered necessary by the impossibility of obtaining other labour in the Colony. It was expressly ruled that it was not to be introduced for the purpose of bringing in cheap labour. It was to be brought in only if other labour was not procurable; otherwise supply and demand were to be left to regulate themselves. It is a matter of discussion and opinion whether that principle has been observed as regards the Transvaal. I will not say, for I really do not know, whether in the case of the Transvaal that condition has been complied with. I am inclined to believe that it has; that is to say, that the necessity has arisen for the employment of foreign labour. But whether I think so or not is not the point. Has the condition laid down by the Secretary of State and adhered to for half a century been complied with or not? On that point I am willing to give the Transvaal the benefit of the doubt. At all events, I say that the Transvaal itself, and the Legislature of the Transvaal, when constituted, are the proper authority to decide that question. Let them decide whether or not it is necessary to employ foreign indentured labour, and if they decide that such employment is necessary, then my first condition is complied with.

The second principle enunciated in the documents to which I have referred is that the recruiting of the labour is to be carried on by the Colonial Government or its agents, and that the transhipment of the immigrants to the Colony is equally to be under the control and direction of the Government. On these points, though they are not the same, I do not think there is sufficient difference between the Ordinances of other Colonies and that of the Transvaal to justify the raising of any serious opposition.

Then what is the next principle? This is a very important point, and one to which I would ask your Lordships' special attention. One essential condition of allowing immigrants to be brought on shipboard from any foreign country to a Colony was this—that every shipload of immigrants must—not might, but must—be accompanied by a proportionate though not an equal number of women. Has that principle been carried out in the Transvaal Ordinance? We know perfectly well that it has not, and yet those who know perfectly well that it has not been observed declare that there is an identity between the Transvaal Ordinance and the Immigration Ordinances of other Colonies.

So much for the voyage. Then comes the landing and what follows after it. The principle laid down is that no restrictions are to be imposed upon the immigrants arriving except such as are absolutely essential to ensure the performance of the contract. Does the Transvaal Ordinance agree with the other Colonial Ordinances in that respect? No, my Lords, it does not; it essentially differs from them. The restrictions imposed by the Transvaal Ordinance are avowedly and openly imposed not only for the purpose of securing the execution of the contract but for quite another purpose, namely, the segregation of the new arrivals from the people of the country. There is another great breach of established principle. I feel, however, bound in honour to admit that, from all I hear from those who have come back from the Cape after having examined the condition of things there, I believe that law is not carried out as it might in strictness be; I believe it has been found to be unworkable, and that it has consequently been practically abandoned. The Chinese are not confined to their compounds as it was expected they would be and as by law they might be. [A NOBLE LORD: Hear, hear.] But that does not at all diminish the iniquity of the law. Its non-observance is not its non-existence and so long as it exists and may at any time be enforced it is in flagrant opposition to previous usage. Let the noble Lord who cheers that statement remember the Answer given in the House of Commons by the late Secretary of State for the Colonies—one of the most appalling Answers ever given by a Minister of the Crown. When asked about the dangers that might arise from a half-caste population, the Minister replied that there would be no half-caste population, that there could be none, because these men were all to be locked up in their compounds. Therefore I say that it is no mitigation to say that the law is not observed; the fact remains that the law was passed and still exists. That, then, is another principle which has been violated.

But there is another point. The principle laid down was, as I have said, that no restrictions were to be imposed except such as were absolutely essential to secure the observance of the contract; that otherwise these men were to have the rights of free men, and when their contracts expired they were to be at liberty to reside in the country and to take up any pursuit they pleased. The Transvaal Ordinance not only repatriates the coolies, but it prohibits them from undertaking any trade or business, and absolutely prevents them from rising in the least degree even in the servile position which they occupy. There is a long list of names of employments at the end of the Ordinance, of the meaning of many of which I have not the slightest idea, but they evidently mean the lowest kinds of employment above absolutely unskilled labour in the mines, and for none of these employments is the immigrant eligible. There, again, I believe the law has been broken. I am told that the Chinese do occupy some of these positions, and I am very glad to hear it. But if they do so, it is not in consequence of that law, but in despite and in breach of the law. That does not make the law any better. As for taking up any trade or pursuit that is absolutely forbidden and the prohibition strictly enforced. He must not hawk a basket of fruit, much less do a job of carpenter's work, under the severest penalties.

I have wished, first of all, to point out the principles which, as I have said, have for fifty years been applied to this kind of legislation; secondly, to point out that in almost every respect those principles have been violated by the Transvaal Ordinance; and, finally, to ask how, in these circumstances, it can be maintained that the Ordinances of the West Indies and of the Transvaal are practically identical? I am sure that those who have maintained that view have done so in perfect good faith. Mr. Balfour, the late Prime Minister, has asserted more than once in his speeches that the Ordinances were absolutely the same. No one can doubt that Mr. Balfour is absolutely incapable of saying anything which he does not firmly believe. But Mr. Balfour has had a great deal of business to attend to, and I have no doubt he takes his opinions from reports which have been made by others without going very minutely into the subject. Otherwise I should say that when noble Lords on that side of the House twit His Majesty's Ministers with inaccuracy in regard to the appellation of slavery, they might just as well be twitted themselves with the monstrous inaccuracy of saying that two things which are absolutely different are identical. From the calm retreat of the Cross Benches—the retreat of age and neutrality.—I at least am not open to any of the imputations which have been cast upon His Majesty's Government with regard to the use of the term "slavery." I have never said that coolie labour was slavery; on the contrary, I have always maintained that, properly managed, coolie labour is an advantage both to the employer and to the employed. But—and I do not stand alone in this view, as I shall show presently—it has dangers which render it necessary that it should be always carefully safeguarded and watched, and those dangers lie in the insidious approach to slavery to which any system of indenture must, if not rigidly controlled, be liable. His Majesty's Government are reproached for saying it has a taint of slavery. That reproach lies equally upon almost every Secretary of State who has administered the Colonial Office during the last half-century. What did Lord Grey say in his original despatches when he first sanctioned the immigration system? He said that in many respects the system of indentured labour is marked by "the incidents of slavery." The "incidents of slavery"—not that it is slavery. What did Lord Kimberley say? He said that it had "a flavour of slavery." Now, my Lords, for the life of me I cannot see the difference between the "flavour of slavery" and the "taint of slavery." A taint is a flavour, and when you say that a thing is tainted with something else it is quite clear that the thing which is tainted is not the thing with which it is tainted; therefore if it is tainted with slavery it is not slavery itself.

Lord Stanmore.

That, my Lords, would be my own feeling about the matter. I have had a good deal of experience, as some of your Lordships are aware, in dealing with coolie labour, and I must say that there was always in one's mind the dangers which arise from this—I must not call it "taint of slavery," but from this approach to the confines of slavery. It was that and that alone which rendered necessary such constant watching of the system. In so many ways things which appeared perfectly harmless to begin with degenerated into abuses, which were on the high road to slavery, if they did not reach that point. I do not wish to weary your Lordships, but let me give one illustration of what I mean. There was a provision in many Ordinances—as I believe is the case in the Transvaal Ordinance—allowing immigrants to re-indenture before the expiry of the original indenture. That seemed a very harmless provision, because the re-indenture had to be entered into before a magistrate at the free will of the immigrant. The immigrant could no doubt decline to re-engage, and the magistrate would, of course, refuse to make the re-engagement. But what would be the condition of such an immigrant for the remainder of the period of his indenture? I do not think his position between the time of his refusal and the termination of his original indenture would be a very happy one. That was the weapon by which re-indentures were so conveniently obtained, and the Secretary of State subsequently found it necessary—and Lord Kimberley was justified in so doing—to prohibit any re-indenturing until the expiry of the then existing indenture and the coolie was a free man. The coolie could then go before a magistrate as a free man, and say of his own free will whether or not he would be re-indentured. That is an example of a harmless provision which may easily be abused unless a constant watch is exercised.

Now, my Lords, having gone through the principles which have been laid down, and having shown how they apply to the Transvaal Ordinance, I would like to assure your Lordships that I have spoken, not from any love of Chinese immigrants, and especially not from any Party feeling, because on these Cross Benches I am independent of Party, but from a feeling that this question affects not only South Africa, but all Colonies in which indentured immigrant labour is employed. Perhaps all your Lordships do not know as well as those who have been governors of such Colonies know how great a pressure is always brought to bear for further restraints to be imposed upon immigrants and further licence to be granted to employers. That pressure is very strong, and when it is seen that, in the Transvaal, Ordinances have been allowed to pass which are so different from those in force elsewhere, the people concerned in other Colonies will say, and with a force which it will be difficult to resist, Why is this? If these things are permitted in the Transvaal, why should they not be permitted in the West Indies, or Mauritius, or Ceylon? I confess I do not see what satisfactory answer can be given. If they are allowed in one place, why not in another? But if any weakness is shown you will find that the whole of the legislation which has been in force for the last half-century for the protection of immigrant labour in these different Colonies will be gradually whittled away until little of it is left, and there will be displayed that taint of slavery which is alleged to exist in the mines of the Transvaal.

But I go further still. It is not only for the coolies of the West Indies, of Mauritius, and of Ceylon that I would speak. I wish to speak also for the white population of those Colonies. I believe there is nothing more degrading, more debasing, or more deteriorating to a population than to have in its midst a servile labour system tainted with "the incidents of slavery." The present Secretary of State for the Colonies will doubtless re-echo that sentiment, for I am sure he has not forgotten the language used by his distinguished father, who wrote these words—words which gained the more force from the knowledge of what he was, it being known that he was no sentimentalist—

> "It is a terrible thing, this living among inferior races; it makes one feel as if Christianity had never come into the world."

For these reasons, unwilling as I am to trespass on your Lordships' time, I have ventured to point out what are the principles laid down in hundreds of despatches written by successive Secretaries of State during the last fifty years, and I have shown in how small a degree they have been complied with in the case of the Transvaal Ordinance, and how great may be the mischief to other Colonies, and to our own race in those Colonies from resulting evils.

There is but one thing more. I feel that I owe this remark to the noble Viscount Lord Milner. I am sure we all felt sorry for Lord Milner when he avowed that he had sanctioned an illegal act. But, my Lords, having heard that avowal from Lord Milner, I, as an old Colonial Governor, feel bound to say that I have more than once committed acts that were illegal; and I believe that there is no Governor who, in wild districts and under exceptional circumstances, has not violated the strict letter of the law. I, therefore, have great sympathy with Lord Milner, feeling that most of us, if we had been in his position, might probably, had we dared to do so, have done the same.

THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER: My Lords, I venture to address your Lordships on this subject because I am one of those who have had the advantage, which many of your Lordships do not possess, of a considerable residence in South Africa. I have lived in the Transvaal under the *régime* of President Kruger, and I have also spent some time in the northern parts and in Rhodesia I rise because I feel that those of my friends who are working for the advancement of the Empire in those territories would imagine that the charges which have been levelled against them had been received with a degree of apathy by their friends in this country if I, as one of those friends, did not say a few words on the subject under discussion.

The noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War stated that he had never seen any of the cartoons which depict the condition of the Chinese as that of slavery. I should like to refer the noble Earl to a speech which he made on 3rd January last; I was not present at the meeting so that I cannot say whether there were any cartoons present, but the noble Earl said—

> "The Government there was now in the hands of a trust obtaining wealth by servile labour."

Although the cartoons may have been absent, I think the intention of the noble Earl was that those who heard him should believe that a state of slavery existed. I am rather nervous of trespassing on this question after the eloquent remarks of the noble Lord on the Woolsack; he will correct me if I am wrong, but I think he said in the course of his able speech that certain conditions which he mentioned were those of slavery. Although the noble Lord asked us to believe that everybody in this country was animated with the same objects and the same sympathies, I am afraid that those words of his will carry to many people in South Africa, who have as deep a sense of honour as any Member of your Lordships' House, the suggestion that they have been engaged in real slavery.

But I will pass from so unsavoury a topic to the question of whether or not this indentured labour is necessary. I am not one of those who believe that indentured labour is the highest class of labour. I do not think that it is. I know from experience that the mines in the Transvaal are incapable of being carried on as commercial undertakings where the majesty of labour is commensurate with the pay of the individual. The figures placed so ably before your Lordships by the noble Lord who spoke second in this debate render it unnecessary for me to deal with anything except broad principles. If every native labourer in the Transvaal, both yellow and black, was to be done away with, and the labour could possibly be supplied by whites at the reduced pay of 5s. a day, it is an economic fact that the mines of the Transvaal could not be carried on. People in this country are apt to think that gold-mining is one of those pursuits that an individual can enter with his sack empty and come away with it full. The days of the Californian and Australian gold fields have given people a glorified idea of the value of gold-mining. Believe me, gold-mining in the Transvaal has to be worked down to the very finest point, and unless that point can be reached it is impossible for the immense trade which this country derives from the supply of mining machinery which is exported annually to the Transvaal to be carried on.

Then there is another point in the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War to which I would like to refer. He said—

> "Then as regards the economic side. The wealth extracted from these mines was sent right out of the colony, while nothing was spent for the improvement of the colony."

Surely, my Lords, he could hardly say that if he had given this question much consideration, because the wages spent in the Transvaal and the expenses of the management represent 75 per cent. of the output of the mines.

Another point which the noble Earl raised was the moral point, and I am certain there must be a misprint in the report from which I am quoting; for he is reported as having said that—

> "The white population of the Transvaal was under 100,000 and that according to the last Return given to the House of Commons on January 10th, 1905, there were then 300,000 Chinese in the Transvaal."

The noble Earl must have meant 30,000. But I presume that he now subscribes to the terms used by the noble Marquess who leads the Liberal Party in this House, or perhaps he did not intend to use so strong a term in reference to——

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I entirely affirm what I said then. I used the words "semi-slavery" or "servile conditions." Perhaps they are stronger.

THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER: I was not pressing it.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I only say that I entirely adhere to what I said then.

THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER: Quite so. A question has been raised by the noble Earl with reference to the repatriation of the Chinese, and I should like to refer to a passage on the subject which appears in the Blue-book. Sir Richard Solomon, who, I believe everybody will agree, has never been in favour of Chinese labour, said—

> "I do not believe the Government would, by the policy proposed, be involved in any large expenditure, if only those coolies were repatriated who really desired to return to China and remain there; but I do fear the expenditure might be large for a very different reason which I shall presently proceed to state. I must also point out that it would be contrary to human nature if, after the Government had undertaken this liability, any coolie who desired to be repatriated admitted that he possessed any savings for the purpose."

I think Sir Richard Solomon has correctly summed up the character of the Chinese coolie. I do not think it is in the "human nature" of the "Heathen Chinee" to disclose the amount of money which he has about his person when it comes to a question of his return to China. I am afraid this provision will be freely taken advantage of by the Chinese. I have had some experience of the Chinese; I have known them in California, and I know that you need never look out for them: they are perfectly certain to be able to look out for themselves. The Chinee, who is not unintelligent by any manner of means, will probably say to himself: "I came here on the undertaking of the gentleman with whom I have contracted to return me to China. The British Government step in and say that they will send me back. I would sooner take the guarantee of the British Government than wait until the end of my contract and then be returned or not, as the case may be." In that event, is it not possible that a very large number of Chinese coolies may desire to go back at the expense of the British Exchequer? Under the Ordinance, when the term of their contract is expired, they will be returned at the expense of the individual for whose benefit, as it is said, they have been imported. I do think that noble Lords opposite should give us some definite information upon this point, because it is a matter which much exercises the minds of people both in Johannesburg and in this country.

I do not wish to weary noble Lords by going into speeches delivered in the past, but the noble Lord on the Woolsack referred to the deputation to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Transvaal headed by General Botha. Every one of the Dutch was eloquent on the subject of the immediate repatriation of the Chinese, but I notice that since then—on 23rd February—General Botha has made a speech, in which he said—

> "A little clique will no longer be allowed to dominate South Africa; the mineowners and the Chinese will be kicked out if the outrages continue, but every industry must be supported and receive as much labour as possible."

He then went on—

> "Whoever imported labour must probably control it."

If responsible government is given to the Transvaal is it not quite possible that the Transvaal itself will under certain circumstances approve of indentured labour? I think it is most probable that they will. My experience of the Dutchman is that he is quite as capable of appreciating the opportunities of making money as the Englishman. The young Dutchman likes to live not only near, but in, a town, and he is not singular in that respect, for we find the same thing in this country. There was a Deputation to the Lieutenant-Governor which brought forth appeals from all the Boers present that the immediate repatriation of the Chinese should be carried out owing to the outrages which had been perpetrated by the Chinese. I believe that the number of those outrages is eight. The Lord Chancellor has told us in most eloquent language that he felt for these people who lived in such abject terror. I can remember the time when in Johannesburg the white people existed in a similar state; when they went out to dinner they did not dare return alone, because of the drunken Kaffirs in all directions. Many white men and white women suffered from the outrages of those drunken Kaffirs, but Parliament looked on very quietly; and nothing was said. But that has all disappeared into the history of the past, and it is not worth reviving, but while the noble Lord was speaking I could not help thinking of the feelings which animated numbers of the white residents in Johannesburg at the time when certain outrages occurred then.

I do not wish to say anything to arouse feeling, but remarks were made by the noble Lord with regard to the system of government instituted by the noble Viscount who initiated this debate. I have seen Lord Milner at work previous to the Bloemfontein Conference; I saw him also in the dark and stormy days of January, 1900, and I can only say this—that if England always has men to come forward and defend her honour and to rule her possessions with the firmness which Lord Milner exhibited during his long period of service in South Africa there is no fear of England's falling in the race of nations.

* The EARL of HARROWBY said there was very little fresh or new to be said upon the subject. It had been discussed very fully in the Press and in another place, and more especially had it been discussed the last two nights in their Lordships' House. They had heard most excellent and weighty speeches from Lord Milner and Lord Harris, which he hoped would be read with care throughout the length and breadth of the country. He ventured, however, that night to appeal to their Lordships on both sides of the House, and he found himself in rather a difficult position, because he proposed to strike out an entirely new line, and to speak more technically. He would speak, if he might, as a banker and a business man. He would venture to speak on behalf of British shareholders and British trade and labour. He might say at once that he held no brief for, nor was he concerned with the so-called millionaires or the South African magnates. He had no sympathy with their procedure in carrying on their operations. They deserved, or some of them, deserved, to his mind, all the hostile criticisms which had been levelled against them. He knew that this agitation, as Lord Harris had said, was not only against the gold-mining industry, but he realised that it was an agitation against the gold gods of South Africa. He thought that some of their Lordships, some of the Members of another place, and the country generally were under a serious misapprehension. They talked of the mine-owners, but there was no individual ownership of the mines. The mines belonged purely and simply to the shareholders. The question of Chinese labour did not affect the millionaires half as much as it affected the numerous body of English shareholders. Mr. Burns had fallen into that trap. He would repeat a few lines of the speech which that right hon. Gentleman made at Battersea after Mr. Balfour's defeat, and in reference to His Majesty's late Cabinet Ministers. He said—

> "The cause is that the country is wearied of being governed by the tricksters of the sporting world, by the riff-raff of the Stock Exchange, and by the general body of wastrels returned to office and power in 1895."

He had yet to learn that the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition and the noble Marquess Lord Londonderry, two of His Majesty's late Ministers, were riff-raff of the Stock Exchange and wastrels. There was not a Labour Member in another place who would have used the language which one of His Majesty's Cabinet used the other day. He would not insult the Leaders of the Government opposite for one moment by supposing that they would wish to be associated with that language, used by one of their colleagues. They were told by those outside that the owners of the mines were millionaires, Jews, and rich men, but, if they took the trouble to inspect the share rolls of the South African mines, they would find 10,000 owners of shares in South Africa and 55,000 foreign shareholders, but they would find that there were 200,000 English shareholders, consisting of an over-whelming majority of small holders, and those were the people on whose behalf he ventured to address their Lordships. It was perfectly true that before the war nobody invested in the South African mines except as a speculation, but after the Colony came under the British flag people bought as an investment, and he could assure their Lordships that when the country was conquered a large number of investors bought shares in the various South Africa companies, because they were told—and could they wonder at it—that there were hundreds of millions in the bowels of the earth to be got out, and that it only depended upon the introduction of alien labour, the only labour available, to enable them to get that gold within their reach. Might he venture to call their Lordships' attention to the effect of the return of the Radical Government on what he would venture to call one of the greatest industries in His Majesty's colonies? What did they find? They found that forty leading South African mines since January 22nd had fallen to the amount of £18,000,000. That was a return that was given him a few days ago, and their Lordships would be conscious that ever since, day by day, there had been a steady fall. He could go further and look to this time last year. Forty-four of the gold-mining companies, representing a value of £145,000,000 then, had now fallen to £88,000,000. Surely that must be the cause of the greatest anxiety to all thoughtful men. He took out the other day casually the value of a few of the leading South African shares, and he found that they had fallen by at least 50 per cent. He knew what it was from experience to find customers asking their bankers to renew their loans and to have to refuse them. He knew what it was when new loans were required and had to be refused. He knew the effect of diminishing balances and the effect of forced sales of stock. He knew the hardships of reductions of household expenditure, and he asked their Lordships to remember that he was not referring to those who could afford to lose, not to those who lived in the West end, but to masses of men and women with small incomes, clerks, governesses, etc., who had not speculated, but who had put their savings into an investment which they thought was safe. They might say that it was a speculation, but he denied it. A large number of the investors had invested on a 6 or 7 per cent. basis in the legitimate desire and expectation of getting a slightly higher rate of interest than they would expect from a so-called second-class investment. His point was that this serious fall was a danger. What was coming next? Would the noble Lord the Colonial Secretary look with equanimity on a further fall of other securities. This was the time for the millionaires, who no doubt, now that prices had fallen from 50 to 75 per cent., would come in and buy large blocks of mining securities. He would leave the question of the small investor, and if he was not wearying their Lordships, he would turn to a point which was perhaps of equal importance, namely, the question of the trade and the labour market of this country. He must apologise if he had to give a few statistics. He knew they were hardly permissible in debate, but they were of a striking nature and would go far to prove his arguments. His great difficulty had been to pick out a few figures which would not weary their Lordships, and which to his mind were very telling and very concise. He knew that he was probably addressing a large number of men who were interested in, and who understood, trading questions. The export and internal trade between this country and South Africa amounted to no less a sum than £50,000,000, and in machinery alone orders were given to the extent of £3,000,000. Already owing to the action of His Majesty's Government orders which had been given for machinery were now cancelled, and he would like to ask those constituencies who manufactured those goods what they thought now about the question of Chinese labour. What must appeal to them was that no less a sum than £5,000,000 was paid in wages to white men in one year, 17,000 being employed, and that, owing to the production of Chinese labour, 5,000 additional white men were employed. That was the present state of affairs, but what were the possibilities of the future with sixty mines undeveloped, and with an output to-day of £20,000,000? They were promised by the experts—Lord Harris would correct him if he was wrong—that there might be an output of £40,000,000 a year. Did not that make them pause and consider the enormous possibilities of the future? He would not touch on the question of slavery. They had had it from noble Lords opposite that they did not think it was slavery; they had had it from the Prime Minister in another place that he did not consider it slavery, and they had had it also from an ex-Radical Mayor of Northampton, who went out himself, who was a Radical candidate, and who was not in the House of Commons to-day, because he had the courage of his opinions. Then why, he would ask His Majesty's Government, this uncertainty, and why this penalising of a great industry? Probably some of their Lordships had visited San Francisco, and like himself had been conducted round that city within a city by detectives and had heard how the Chinese had made it one of the most prosperous cities of America. Why should not the Chinese make for this country the Transvaal, which had endless wealth and endless possibilities, which must redound to the prosperity of the working classes of this country? Might he turn for a brief moment and ask their Lordships to consider the financial effect of the restriction or of the abolition of Chinese labour? Their Lordships had only to read, and they would find that vast sums had be en spent on the development of this great industry. If the Chinese were taken away, those hundreds of thousands of pounds which had been spent would be lost. Did His Majesty's Government intend or not intend to give the mine-owners, the shareholders, compensation for the enormous loss which would ensue? Let them consider also for a moment the loss of revenue to the Transvaal. The profit tax to-day produced £150,000, and the internal trade owing to the mines produced no less a sum than £4,250,000. Was the loss of that what His Majesty's Government could contemplate without some feeling of hesitation? They were told that immediately the Chinese were sent out of the country 6,000 men would be placed out of work. Lord Selborne, of whom the Colonial Secretary spoke in such kindly terms the previous night, said—

> "I do know that the amount of human suffering would be terrible."

Surely that alone should make His Majesty's Government hesitate. Then as regarded the vexed question of labour, if their Lordships would refer to the Blue-book, they would find that the demand in excess of supply was no less than 129,000 labourers, and that a further number of 196,000 would be required in five years. The only genuine opposition to his mind came from the Labour Members. He, for one, wished they would appoint a Committee to go out and investigate the question for themselves. Failing that, he wished they would discuss the question quietly with those best able to give them expert information. He could assure them that they on that side of the House approached the question with a sincere desire for the honour of their country, and with a sincere desire to promote the trade of the country, and to employ the surplus population which they were told existed in certain districts to-day. They might feel assured that they on that side of the House sympathised with them in their desires and aspirations, and time would show, and not a very long time, that they, the Members of the Conservative and Unionist Party, were, after all, as in the past, their truest and best friends. In conclusion, he would only ask the noble Lord the Colonial Secretary to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what his financial advisers in the city said upon the question, and he would urge, as Lord Harris had done, that if he could see his way to appoint an impartial Commission, they would be perfectly prepared to stand or fall by its decisions.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said he could not very closely follow the remarks of the noble Lord. Although he had set up a strong plea on behalf of bankers who had to accommodate their customers and on behalf of shareholders who had invested in a security which had proved disappointing, he did not think those issues bore very directly upon the question before the House, whether the character of the labour under indenture in South Africa partook of the nature of slavery, or whether it did not, and how far individual members of the Liberal Party were responsible not for what they might have said, but for what other people on the same side might have said. One of the remarks of the noble Lord at the conclusion of his speech seemed to him to be not very conducive to the support of the champions of the South African ordinance. He told them how under the protection of detectives he went round San Francisco and had seen how the prosperity of that city and of California had been built up by Chinese immigration;

but in order to have made the case parallel to that of the Transvaal the Chinaman ought to have been shut in and restricted to servile work and not to have gone freely about San Francisco, following any trade. He therefore did not think the San Francisco experience was any encouragement for the South African Ordinance. There had been many questions put to Members on that side of the House, calling upon them under threat of penalties to disavow what other people had said on their side; and it seemed to him that the latest modification of the South African Ordinance had affected the minds of the noble Lords opposite. One of the later Amendments proposed to introduce something of the old Saxon system of Frank-pledge by collecting fines from all the miners if some committed iniquities and the others did not denounce them. He could not think that was a reasonable principle to apply here. Any person who had spoken on the matter was clearly responsible for what he had said, but he could not suppose that at the close of a heated election every person was to be answerable for whatever anybody had said on his side. Intemperate, calumnious, unfair imputations had been made against the Liberal Party in the past, but that did not defend them in making intemperate, calumnious, unfair accusations on the other side; whilst he was quite prepared to defend himself, he did not think, having recollections of the way in which Liberals had been calumniated and blackened in the past, that it came well from those, who as a Party had used that intemperate language, to turn upon them. He would like to ask the noble Lords opposite if they did not remember a little more than twenty years ago how Mr. Gladstone was habitually spoken of in polite society not as the G. O. M., but as the M. O. G. He was sure noble Lords would remember what those letters were intended to indicate. Advocates of Home Rule had also been called traitors. His withers were unwrung, for he had ploughed a lonely furrow for twenty years because he did not join in advocating a policy of Home Rule, but he did think it was rather severe when a policy, however mistaken, was treated as treason. It was quite common for Mr. Gladstone and his followers to be talked of as traitors. He remembered perfectly well the sort of cartoon which represented Mr. Gladstone and his friends as house-breakers and burglars because they disestablished the Irish Church. These things might be part of the humour of politics, and, if somebody had come forward and said it was an outrage to have described Mr. Gladstone as a burglar, the noble Lords opposite would have thought they were wanting in a sense of humour. Talking of this very accusation of slavery, they might, of course, describe a thing as slavery when they could not indict a man for it under the law; but, if the character of the institutions he supported partook of the nature of slavery, then he thought that in rhetoric a man might fairly use that compendious expression. To suppose that people did not understand the difference between a picturesque and rhetorical expression and a legal indictment seemed to him quite absurd. For his part he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that, although he had not stumped the country on the cry of "slavery"—he did not know that he had used the word—he agreed entirely with what had been quoted from Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, that there was a taint of slavery, and with the Lord Chancellor that it was a kind of half slavery. The moment they stepped aside from absolute freedom of contract between employer and employed, they took a step towards slavery. They might have a serfdom which was not complete slavery but which they described as slavery, and they might have indentured labour which came very near to slavery. Whether, however, it was a mere rhetorical expression or whether the character of the indenture was so severe as almost to amount to slavery, he took it that the question they ought to consider was, had the indentures and the law as worked in South Africa been inconsistent with the due rights of any free man, whether white or yellow? He was afraid the ordinary person they spoke to, and certainly the ordinary colonist they spoke to had a very different measure of the rights of white and yellow men. He was sometimes shocked when he heard people talk as though the people who originally inhabited South Africa had no right in that country or to its soil except on the sufferance of white men. The noble Marquess who introduced the debate referred to the danger that they might forget the rights of the native Kaffir in being too zealous for the rights of the Chinese coolie. He thought it was in the dispatches from Lord Milner to Mr. Lyttelton, or from Mr. Lyttelton to Lord Milner, that mention was made of the terrible danger of passing into the greater inequity of compulsory laws which would force the natives of South Africa to work for wages for the white men. He quite agreed, and he should be sorry if they forgot that the rights of the natives while they were busy thinking of the possible hardships imposed upon the Chinese immigrant. He was sorry to say that he had not been in South Africa, but he had taken some interest in the native question, and people familiar with the work of the Colonial Office would tell them that in the history of South Africa there had not only been no consideration shown by the Boers for the native races in the course of their conquest of the country, but that there had not been a sympathetic policy towards the native races on the part of the British whites of South Africa. He remembered that about 1880 or 1881, when the Government made over Basutoland to the Cape, there was a campaign which lasted for two years, and he was happy to say Basutoland defeated the Cape Colonists and vindicated their independence. They were then warned to disarm Basutoland, but when the Boer War came they were very glad that their policy had failed. He was sorry to say of the English race that when there was an attractive piece of land for colonisation, the rights of Indians, of Kaffirs, or of any other people were very little considered. He hoped the House, regardless of the rise or fall of shares in the market, regardless of the anxieties of the clients of City bankers, who sought relief in vain, would consider that the rapid development of the resources of South Africa ought not to take priority of a due regard for the rights and interests of the inhabitants of the country. He would like to mention one of the facts which came into the Blue-book and which to his mind showed that, with the best intentions, people, as the noble Lord on the Cross Benches had said, who had to do with a community in which there were inferior races, gradually had their susceptibilities blunted, and were more solicitous for the rights of white people than for those of coloured people. They thus saw British officials, who ought to stand for justice, become a little warped and slide away from that standard of right which we in this country, not troubled with coloured races, were able to maintain. Lord Harris, in a speech the previous night, threw great discredit upon some persons mentioned in the Blue-book. He very justly stigmatised Mr. Pless as a person of infamous character and said he ought not be considered; but, when they read the Blue-book carefully, they would see that the more they stigmatised Mr. Pless the more they stigmatised the type of management which made him possible. It was Mr. Pless, who was guilty of this atrocity, who had been for upwards of three months, not in full management, but a sort of Chinese manager of one of the most important mines, and the witnesses who told them of his bad character, told them that his mismanagement, his cruelty, and his incapacity had brought the Chinamen of that mine into a state of rebellion, and that it took a very great deal of trouble to bring them back to reason. Surely the worse they made Mr. Pless out the more discredit attached to the mine-owners who kept him in his position for some months when they knew that he was doing badly, and that to some extent the supervision provided by the organisation of the Government failed to detect this. Lord Harris also tried to throw discredit upon Mr. Boland, because he thought he had got his information from Mr. Pless, but he took it that the telegrams and dispatches from South Africa confirmed in substance Boland's charges. Boland said, not of his own knowledge, that he was informed by the person in the mine whose duty it was to record the punishments, that the floggings went on at the rate of forty-two a day, including Sundays. There was a direct denial to Mr. Boland, but, when it was watered down, it was reduced to a mere exaggeration. First they had to take the Sundays out; and secondly the floggings were exaggerated by 75 per cent. If noble Lords would make a calculation, they would see that the floggings admitted by mine managers were twenty-four a day. What did they think of discipline which was maintained by floggings twenty-four a day? That in itself seemed to him to be a work of condemnation. He would like to know what the Home Office would think if the governor of a prison was unable to keep discipline without say ten floggings a day. Why, the governor would be sent to the right-about. In order to discredit Mr. Boland, they said that as a matter of fact there was no record. What were they to think of such a state of things going on for a twelvemonth? These punishments were taking place at the rate of twenty-four a day at one mine. No record was kept, and there were no means of knowing the exact amount. He thought this indicated far more seriously than the charge of Mr. Boland what was the atmosphere in which the mineowners were living, and how they were carrying out the discipline of their mines. Apart altogether from Mr. Boland, however, there was another witness whom nobody had attacked, and that was Mr. Bianchini. For more than a year he was Chinese superintendent in charge, responsible for seeing after the Chinese and reporting complaints. He was quoted on the side of the mineowners in an earlier part of the Blue-book in order to refute either Mr. Pless or Mr. Boland, but a letter of his of October, 1905, was some indication of the atmosphere in the Transvaal. Mr. Bianchini, being an alien, would not come forward until he had a guarantee of fair treatment, because, if he said anything against the mineowners he feared that he might find himself deported from the colony. In October, 1904, he animadverted upon the way the Chinese were harassed, and writing again in October, 1905, he said that things had not improved. He gave a very long series of complaints, and what struck him was the reply of Mr. D. O. Malcolm, the Governor's private secretary, on page 56. The things seemed trivial in themselves, but he thought they were evidence of the disregard for the rights of the coolie which characterised the management of the mines. There was a man who had lost a limb early in the year, and he had not had an artificial limb, or his compensation, amounting to £5. The reply was that the wound had not healed sufficiently till the latter part of August for the fitting of the limb, but that was no excuse for the fact that the coolie was kept out of his £5 till this trouble was made and Mr. Bianchini demanded it. Mr. Bianchini made another complaint that the coolies who were entitled after certain months' service to an increase of their wages to 1s. 6d. per day had not got it, and that, although he had raised the complaint repeatedly, no attention was paid to it. The answer was that somewhere in the month of October the mineowners admitted their liability and that payment would be credited. His Lordship wished to call attention to a point with reference to the 1s. 6d. a day, which seemed to him to be serious. In the older Blue-books they would find many urgent telegrams between Lord Milner and Mr. Lyttelton with reference to the limited rate of wage to the coolie; There had been a promise made of 2s. a day. He thought Lord Grey in that House said he hoped it would be 2s. a day, and 2s. was named. Representations were made—he called attention to it as long ago as 1904—and in all the discussions Mr. Lyttelton seemed to be pressing for fairer play to the coolies. He got no encouragement from the Colony, but was over-ruled, and from time to time he gave way. On this question of wage, however, Mr. Lyttleton said distinctly in one telegram, April 19th, 1904, that unless 1s. 6d. a day was guaranteed, there would certainly be discontent. The mineowners said that if it was absolutely necessary they would consent to 1s. 6d., and Lord Milner telegraphed to Mr. Lyttelton on April 1st to that effect. Afterwards, however, he telegraphed that it was not convenient and not desirable. More messages passed and at last Lord Milner telegraphed on May 4th—

> "The mineowners will guarantee 1s. 6d. to all not on piece-work within three months of arrival at mines."

What scandalised him was that that undertaking was not carried out as they would see if they read Mr. Bianchini's letter. Nothing like 1s. 6d. was paid, and the time was raised from three to six months. Of course all the cosmopolitan capitalists and small investors were very keen about their dividends, and the agents out in the Transvaal were trying to do their best for their employers. They knew quite well that white employers dealing with white labour would try to drive them as hard as possible, and that it needed the vigilance of the State to protect the labourer, and certainly in the Transvaal their only protection was the local government. No doubt Lord Milner was convinced that the financial and economic prosperity of the gold-mining industry was vital for the success, the stability, and the loyalty of the Transvaal, and consequently vital for the whole of South Africa, and that, therefore, he was bound to promote the interest of the mineowners as being the pivot on which the building up of South Africa depended. Habitually, all through the transactions between the Government and the Colony, whenever the Home Government tried and secured an advantage for the coolie, telegrams came back from the Transvaal appealing; and he saw that the Regulations distinctly and absolutely receded from the undertaking given on behalf of the mineowners in the matter of the 1s. 6d. He did not want to take up any more time of the House, but he thought he had given one or two points. In the case of Pless, his appointment reflected no credit upon the people who employed him in the mines; in the case of Boland, though there was an attempt to minimise and explain away his charges, yet substantially they were admitted; and in the case of Bianchini he thought the charges were strongly proved. There was one case mentioned by Mr. Bianchini to which he would like to call attention, because it showed the singular way in which in replies from South Africa the real point of a serious charge was utterly disregarded. There was a case in which five Chinese coolies were marched down from the mines and put in prison in a small corrugated iron building, six feet by five feet and eight feet high, and kept there for twenty-four hours. This was sent to South Africa for an explanation and the explanation was that the men were taken there to protect them from the violence of other coolies. That comparatively was an unimportant thing; the real question was why the people were confined in a space so disgracefully inadequate. It was quite possible to measure the room, but there was no notice taken of the serious charge of confining people in a very improper place. Yet they were told that there was no case at all. The reply was—

> "Allegation, five coolies were confined with unnecessary severity: Lord Selborne learns from the superintendent of foreign labour there is no foundation for this statement. They were removed from compound for their safety."

That was not the question; the question was, what were the dimensions of the place in which they were confined. These were some of the points that could be picked up out of the Blue-books. Liberals said that the Ordinance was bad when it was under discussion in the House of Commons, but he also said that it appeared to him to have been administered in a way unfriendly and unjust to the proper claims of the imported coolie. Lord Harris the previous day said that the coolie could not have been badly treated because out of 1,700 who had gone away, 1,500 had tried to go back again to South Africa. But if they looked at the Blue-book, who were they? One hundred and ninety-eight repatriated themselves at their own cost or by the subscriptions of their fellow workmen, and he did not gather that these tried to go back. The others were sent back to China long before their indentures were up, evidently because they were found unsatisfactory and unfit to work. That was evident from the fact that 1,400 of them tried to smuggle themselves back and were rejected at the Chinese port of shipment. They were useless people, probably unable to earn their living either in China or South Africa, and they no doubt thought they would be better off in South Africa than dying of starvation in China. As to the remainder, they were told that some hundreds had either died or had become incapacitated from sickness and could not go back. He did not, therefore, think that the evidence with regard to those 1,600 or 1,800 showed much as to what the able-bodied Chinaman would do at the end of his time. But, as far as he could make out—and the testimony of Lord Halifax was to the same effect—Lord Selborne determined as soon as he got out to reform these things in every way he could. He could not see all the things himself and must be subject to information he obtained from others; but, as the noble Lord himself had said, the Colonial Secretary relied upon him to help him in securing as good administration as possible. He had no doubt that, like the withholding of compensation, many things were being stopped, and that whatever could be done under discipline and coercion would be done. He was afraid that all through South Africa they could not find much sympathy with coloured and native labour, but that the white population considered the coloured population was there to administer to their requirements, and were lucky if they were allowed to get a bare living while doing it; and he did not think that the fact that the Ordinance was now being administered with far greater humanity and care at all did away with its vices. He agreed with the noble Lord on the Cross Benches, and quite recognised that in a colony where they could not get white labour to do all the work, and where the bulk of it was done before by native races, with proper safeguards and so long as they kept the door open to develop it as an English place, they might import some indentured labour; but, if they allowed indentures at all, they must allow them with the maximum, and not the minimum, of liberty compatible with the conditions of employment. There had been many times in the history of the world, when severe misfortune had driven people to barter their liberty for the sake of preserving their lives; but it was bad to allow such a thing to go on, and it was the duty of the English Parliament to say that such a state of things should not be allowed to continue.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU said he rose with some diffidence on this the first occasion on which he addressed their Lordships' House, and he should not have intruded had it not been that in two ways he might claim to have certain experience of the subject being discussed. During the very troubled time just after the Jameson Raid, he had the advantage of studying the politics of South Africa, and on a former occasion he was also in the Western States of America, in British Columbia, shortly after the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act. He was a witness at that time of the feeling between the races, and of the consequences which ensued from the employment of Chinese labour. The whole development of British Columbia had been worked by Chinese labour, and he could look back and say without prejudice that he did not believe America would be so advanced to-day in the Western States, or that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been built in so reasonable a time, if it had not been for that labour. He could honestly say that the agitation here over Chinese labour was comparatively a small thing to the agitation in America. He did not know whether any of the noble Lords had had any experience of that agitation, but he could tell them that the Chinamen were robbed and murdered in the principal streets of the towns of America, and that practically a social revolution took place. They could draw conclusions and have some idea from that fact as to what would happen if a large country, peopled entirely by white people, came into collision with a yellow race. There were, of course, two distinct features of the debate. One was the question of the franchise in South Africa, and that was to his mind, though not the more immediate, the more important question eventually; and secondly there was the question of cheap labour for the mines. He had always noticed in other places besides America, in Queensland for instance, that the early development of an undeveloped country had to be achieved by some form of cheap labour. It was really a stage in the economical development of a country. They had first of all to get their pioneer into a country. Then came the labour problem, and really the best kind of labour was the native labour of the country, but, if they could not get that, they must get the next best. They might take it, though he would not lay it down as a law against their noble Lordships, that it was an economic law that they could not develop a country without cheap labour first, and that they must go on with some kind of imported labour until they got cheap food, and until they got railways built, and facilities for reducing the cost of living. He realised that in the

Transvaal, as in the Western States of America, they could not proceed with railway or agricultural development, or with any kind of development at the first stage, until they had this cheap labour. He did not suppose any noble Lord hoped or wished that Chinese labour would endure for a long time. They were all agreed that in itself it was undesirable, but the question was, whether the Government were going to cut off this necessary supply before they could employ white or other labour economically—he did not mean low wages—for the development of the country. Until they could do that they must put up with the disadvantage of cheap labour. He remembered that in British Columbia that certainly the most peaceable part of the mining population were the Chinese. He had the fortune or misfortune to stay for some time in a mine entirely worked by Chinese labour, and, whilst he had a good many things stolen by so-called Britishers or Americans, John Chinaman never stole anything of his. He could to that extent speak of the comparative honesty of the yellow races when so employed. The time came when living became cheaper, and the Americans thought they could work without the Chinese, and they were quite right in turning them out. After that, however, a period of depression set in for five or six years, and the value of everything depreciated. The mines ceased to pay, and there were various economic difficulties which were only got over after a time of great patience. In South Africa they were face to face with this problem at the present time. They could not live in Johannesburg under £1 a day, and that was too high a wage if the low grade mines were to be developed and made to pay. They would have to remain undeveloped, because they could only work high grade mines without cheap labour. They could not get sufficient Kaffir labour to fill up the difference. Some objection had been taken to Chinese labour on account of the fact that they did not take their wives to the Transvaal. They all knew that that was a disadvantage, and that if it were possible it would be an excellent thing to provide accommodation for their wives. If, however, they were going into that question, noble Lords should remember that the Kaffirs were polygamists, and he should be sorry to say that a man who lived in polygamy was more moral than a man who lived without a wife at all. The Kaffir worked mainly to buy oxen, and when he was in South Africa oxen were generally exchanged for a wife and he got back to his native village. He could quite understand that at the present moment it would be seriously against the interests of the mines and the development of South Africa to do away with Chinese labour. Some noble Lords had expressed surprise at the agitation which swept over the country at the general election on this question, but personally he did not think it mattered very much, at least not to any great degree, whether the electorate thought it was slavery or not. He was inclined to agree with the Lord Chancellor that they were looking further than the present day. There were two causes which operated against Chinese labour amongst the electorate. One was the trade union feeling, that if it was possible to have cheap labour in one colony it was possible in another, and that it might even extend to this country; and then there was the standard of comfort to which the Lord Chancellor had referred. No one could be surprised at that sentiment, and, if it was ever imagined that Chinese labour could be introduced into this country, he had no doubt that noble Lords on that side of the House would be as much against the continuance of it in South Africa as noble Lords on the other side of the House. There was no suggestion except that Chinese labour was only a temporary way out of the difficulty in South Africa. Noble Lords had referred to the fact that the position in South Africa was unique, because Chinese labour was employed there. But in the Straits Settlements and in Queensland they had been employed; they had been employed by the Governments in building works, and they had in British Guiana and in other places been employed until it became possible to employ white labour. The really serious question seemed to him to be as to what His Majesty's Government was going to do with reference to the franchise. That seemed to him to be the really important question, because Chinese labour in three or four years might be done away with without any extended disadvantage to the mines. If they were going to have a franchise which would put the British permanently in a minority, it would be an important matter. It seemed to him that the Government would be more than well advised to send out an impartial Commission to deal with the question of the franchise, including, if they liked, the question of Chinese labour. It was the most important question for the settlement of South Africa. If they put the franchise on the basis of population, it was obvious that the British interest must be in a minority, but if they put it on the electorate it was obvious, as far as they could see, that there would be a fair balance between the two races. He implicitly believed in the work of the noble Lord who opened the debate and thought that time would heal the difficulties in South Africa. He, therefore, appealed to His Majesty's Government to consider the question of the franchise even more carefully than the question of Chinese labour, and to see that the basis was one that would be fair to both races in South Africa. He should not have intervened in the debate had he not had experience in South Africa, but he did not think he was far wrong when he said he ought to warn their Lordships that unless His Majesty's Government treated the British settlers and British interests out there with the greatest possible consideration they might be face to face with a coalition between the mining interest and the Dutch, in which both sides would give something away and expect to gain something, and in that coalition they would agree—it might be an infamous or a just bargain, but he preferred to call it an infamous bargain—that they would ignore the influence of this country and practically cut themselves adrift. He was not saying this in an alarmist spirit, because he was the last person to take an alarmist view, but there was this serious danger. He knew for a fact that it was rising to-day, and he thought it could only be averted by sending out an impartial Commission which would settle the franchise on a fair basis.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I think the House is indebted to the noble Viscount on the Cross Benches for having provoked a debate which has been one of the most interesting and instructive to which we have lately listened. His speech produced a deep impression on all who had the good fortune to listen to him. It has produced a deep impression out of doors, and I am tempted to say that it has not been without its effect upon His Majesty's Government. After listening to the speeches of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, I cannot help hoping that, after all, the difference between us upon certain points is not so profound as might be supposed; and I certainly always in this House prefer to dwell on the points on which the two sides are at one rather than on those in regard to which they differ. I refer especially to what has been said with regard to the question of a new constitution for these two Colonies. There is complete agreement between us as to the goal at which we desire ultimately to arrive. We are at one in thinking that that goal is to be found in responsible government; and, if we differ, it is not so much as to the ultimate object in view as with regard to the pace at which we are to move and the means by which the goal is to be reached.

The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack dealt with great force upon the objections to the particular form of constitution which the late Secretary for the Colonies had intended to confer upon the Transvaal. He pointed out that the kind of constitution which we speak of as "representative" as distinguished from "responsible" government is illogical in its character and calculated to produce a great deal of friction. Those statements may be perfectly true. But, my Lords, there are worse evils than friction and the absence of logic. And I would ask your Lordships whether it has not been the case with most of our great Colonies that, before being given full responsible government, they have had to pass through a kind of probationary stage of representative, but not responsible, government in the full sense of the word?

I am under the impression that in the Cape Colony for eighteen years representative as distinguished from responsible government prevailed; and I believe that in Natal representative government prevailed for no less than forty years; and, although there may have been friction and inconvenience, I have not been told that the condition of things produced by a constitution of that kind was in any sense intolerable. I must say that it seems to me quite conceivable that, in a young community, especially when that community has been distracted by racial or Party divisions, there may be a great advantage in introducing at first a government in which the administration shall be, for a time, under the guidance of an independent executive. I believe that, in the history of our colonies, such guidance has proved to be valuable; and, therefore, I should not be so much inclined as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack to brush on one side as unworthy of approval a constitution founded provisionally upon representative and not responsible government.

As to the character of the new constitution, and as to the safeguards which might be introduced in it in order to protect the loyalist population from unfair treatment, it is quite clear that His Majesty's Government have not said their last word. The Prime Minister, unless I am mistaken, stated a few days ago that he desired to preserve an open mind upon some of these points, and that we were wofully in need of fuller information. The noble Earl opposite, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, speaking yesterday evening, told us that in his opinion time and inquiry were necessary; and, unless I misunderstood the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, he, too, fully admitted the necessity of full time for the consideration of these difficult questions; and he gave us, with an earnestness which must have produced an effect upon those who heard him, an assurance that His Majesty's Government were fully determined that fair play should be given to all sections of the community in the two colonies. With those assurances I, for one, am contented, and I reserve my judgment until His Majesty's Government are able to give us fuller information upon this all-important question.

I could have wished that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had been able to give a rather more reassuring answer to the noble Viscount when he expressed a hope that we should be afforded an opportunity of criticising and discussing the new constitution before it was finally decided upon, The noble Earl did not absolutely refuse that request, I think he told us that he desired to obtain further advice upon the subject. That was, perhaps, a reasonable stipulation. He mentioned that no such opportunity had been given for the discussion of the Lyttelton Constitution; but then I would venture to remind him, in the first place, that the Lyttelton Constitution had reference to one colony only, and, in the next place, what is infinitely more important, that the Lyttelton Constitution was a provisional constitution, designed to cover a period of transition, whereas the constitution which His Majesty's Government are now elaborating for the two colonies is, unless we are misinformed, intended to bestow upon them full self-government and a measure of independence from which it would be impossible for us ever to take anything back. I venture to express the hope that we may have an opportunity of offering our comments upon the proposals of His Majesty's Government before we are confronted with accomplished facts.

Upon the question of Chinese labour I will not detain your Lordships more than a few moments, for it is a part of the subject which has been very adequately discussed. I think the noble Viscount must have been pleased to observe, as the debate proceeded, that one after another several of the positions formerly occupied by our opponents were gracefully evacuated. The full-blown charge of slavery, which we were told we had connived at in the interest of the millionaires, has been frankly dropped, although it has been repeated in a milder and more qualified form.

We have, of course, never contended that the system of Chinese labour might not be attended by abuses. To my mind, when you introduce 50,000 Asiatics into South Africa you are not unlikely to include a good many individuals who "left their country for their country's good," and there will be irregular and regrettable incidents occurring among them. It is probable at the very outset there were insufficient means for sifting the great mass of individuals who came forward as candidates for this employment; and, again, it would surely be a great deal to expect that among the persons employed in the supervision of the coolies, persons who were mostly themselves Chinamen, there should not have been some entirely unfitted for the duties which were thrown upon them. But, admitting all these things, it has been abundantly proved that the condition of things among these Chinese coolies in no way corresponds with that described last year in speeches delivered in this House by my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture and others who frequently took part in the recurring debates on the subject. The charges of confinement in cages, of crowded stockades, of barbarous and inhuman punishments, all these things, I am happy to say, have now dropped out of sight.

Another charge, one difficult to refer to except in general terms, has also dropped out of sight. In the speech delivered by the most rev. Prelate and in those by other right rev. Prelates one point was repeatedly dwelt upon, and that was that these Chinese were likely to introduce into British colonies vices and habits calculated to bring permanent and dangerous demoralisation to the whole community. I can find in the Blue-book no trace of evidence that these apprehensions have been realised, nor has this count lately figured in the indictment.

As to the treatment of the coolies, there is ample evidence to show that on the whole it has been all that could be desired. Visitor after visitor has gone to the Transvaal and judged for himself, like Lord Halifax, who addressed the House with excellent effect earlier in the evening, and from one and all we hear that the grounds of former attack cannot be substantiated. The statement of the Secretary for the Colonies that there is no longer occasion for that inquiry into the facts which many of us desired seems to me also to be conclusive upon this point.

The noble Earl quarrelled with my use of the word "experiment," and he seemed to be under the impression that when I said that the importation of these coolies was an experiment I thereby committed myself to the view that the arrangement was necessarily a terminable one. My interpretation of the word "experiment" differs entirely from that of the noble Earl's. I used the word "experiment" as the equivalent of a shorter word, I mean the word "trial." You adopt a certain measure provisionally If it succeeds you continue it; if it does not succeed you withdraw it. Our case is that upon the whole, in spite of the difficulties which have been detected—most of them have been by this time remedied—the importation of these coolies has proved a success, and that, with proper safeguards, it may be allowed to prevail in the future. I think I may appeal in support of this contention to the fact that His Majesty's Government regard the system as not only tolerable, but as so tolerable that they are prepared to keep it in force for an indefinite time pending the grant of full self-government to the Transvaal.

Now, I quite understood, at least I thought so, the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to Chinese labour as they originally explained it. They desired to amend the system; they desired to keep it provisionally in force, and finally to refer the whole question to the judgment of the colonial government. That was a perfectly intelligible policy. That was the policy proclaimed by several of his Majesty's Ministers, amongst others by Mr. Haldane, who, I remember, said that in his view, and in the view of his colleagues, the question was one of which they might "wash their hands," and which was to be handed over for final disposal to the Government of the Colony. But it now appears. after all, that the question is not going to be left to the final disposal of the Colony; and I must say that the utterances of His Majesty's Ministers upon that point seem to me to require some elucidation. It was explained by the Under-Secretary that when the Colony has become seized of the question and has prepared its own proposals, if those proposals should prove to be unsatisfactory the co-operation of His Majesty's Government will be denied.

The refusal of His Majesty's Government to co-operate would of course mean that the whole scheme of introducing Chinese labour would break down, because it depends for its success upon the good offices of the Foreign Office with the Chinese Government. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer went a great deal further, and intimated that not only would there be no co-operation, but that, if the arrangements proposed by the Colonial Government were not entirely to the mind of His Majesty's Government, they would be disallowed by the Colonial Office. So this is what it comes to. The matter is to be referred to the Colonial Government, but if the action of the Colonial Government is unsatisfactory to His Majesty's Ministers, its proposals are to be negatived. The slate is to be washed clean, and the existing regulations are, we understand, to be got rid of before the question is turned over to the Colony, but if the Colony chooses to write on the slate the exercise is to be sent up to the noble Earl for correction and may even be thrown back into the face of the Colonial Government. I must say that a more singular way of introducing the Transvaal to the advantages of complete self-government could scarcely be invented.

Now the noble Earl told us the other evening what was to be the test of the admissibility of the colonial proposals. He said that they would be disallowed if they were found to infringe the right of freedom. There is a splendid vagueness about that sentence. We have had the vague use of the word "slavery"; we have here an equally vague use of the word freedom. I should like to ask whoever follows me in this discussion whether by freedom we are to understand the right of the coolie to roam unrestricted wherever he pleases, his right to settle permanently in the Colony, and his right to take up any trade or profession; and whether the word freedom also includes full political rights. These are very important points, because it is perfectly clear that if that is what is meant by "freedom" or even part of that, the Colony will not take the Chinese coolies at the price. And, indeed, the noble Marquess the Leader of the House told us in his speech the other night, when speaking of the restrictions and disabilities imposed upon Chinamen, that if you were to have Chinese labour at all you were obliged to make these arrangements.

Does it not come to this—that you are going to confront the Colonial Government with this dilemma? They will have to choose between complete paralysis of the only great industry of the Colony—a paralysis the effects of which have been fully described by Lord Selborne in his despatch—or the admission of these Asiatics on terms on which we know perfectly well the Colonies are not prepared to accept them. That offer seems to me, if I may say so without disrespect, a somewhat disingenuous one. And, my Lords, is there not surely some inconsistency in this extraordinary hurry to confer fully developed self-government on the Colony, when we are at the same time denying to it the right of dealing as they please with a question which interests them more than any other, and with which other Colonies have been allowed to deal from time to time in the manner which they thought most appropriate?

I will not at this late hour of the night attempt to examine the amendments which the Government are about to introduce, or have introduced, into the Ordinance. But I should like to say one word as to one of these amendments—I mean the new Regulation with regard to repatriation. We understand that you are going to allow any coolie who sincerely desires to be repatriated to return home at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. What will happen when it becomes known among these 50,000 Chinamen that any man who is restless or dissatisfied, or home-sick can go to the authorities and ask for £17 10s. with which to pay his expenses back to China? I have always been led to believe that the Chinaman is a somewhat astute individual; and I anticipate that, when he finds that he can obtain at the expense of the country a sort of glorified week-end ticket to China, he is likely to avail himself extensively of the privilege.

These are all matters which might very well have been examined by a Commission if His Majesty's Government had appointed one, and I regret sincerely that such a Commission is not going to be appointed.

To my mind the most hopeful feature of this discussion is the frank admission made by His Majesty's Ministers that more time is needed for the examination of these questions. I accept that statement with gratitude, and I accept with equal gratitude the assurance of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, that no pains will be spared to secure fair play to all classes of the community in these colonies. My only fear is that His Majesty's Government having, during the course of the election, and during the course of the debates in Parliament, as I conceive, committed themselves imprudently on this question, may find it difficult to avoid making good their words by action of a precipitate and undesirable character. Of this, I am sure, my Lords, that while the country will readily forgive them and their friends for any thoughtless and rash words which may have been spoken during the course of this controversy, the country will not forgive them if, in order to redeem these pledges, they inflict irremediable injury upon our South African Colonies or do a cruel injustice to the men who, as Lord Roberts told us earlier this evening, stood by us in our hour of need and were our gallant comrades in arms during the long struggle from which we are but now emerging.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I greatly regret that my noble friend who leads this House is still not well enough to take his place, and that in his absence one of his lieutenants again has to act for him. I hope it may not be very long before the noble Marquess is among us again. This debate has been in some respects of a rather singular character. In reply to my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War, the noble and learned Lord opposite explained how it came about that this notice on the Paper took the form of a Question rather than a Motion. I cannot say that I entirely appreciated the reasons he gave, and it certainly does seem to me that, though in this House we are not very particular as to order, two questions of this kind form a rather small peg to hang a two days debate on.

But this debate, as the noble Marquess has said, has had many features of interest. In the first place, we have had the pleasure of hearing some of those speak who have never addressed the House before, and others who do not address it often. Apart from my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, whose speech I know was heard with pleasure even by those who did not agree with all of it, many interesting speeches have been made. It was a rather singular fact that when noble Lords opposite were on this side of the House it scarcely ever happened, with their vast majority, that any independent Member addressed the House on any subject whatever. Now, apparently, we are in for a change in that respect, and I distinctly welcome the fact, even though I suppose we may, in the course of debate, be the sufferers by it.

This debate has run on two perfectly distinct lines which have sometimes intersected, but yet have remained on the whole separate. There has been the question of the future form of government in South Africa and the question of Chinese labour. The noble Marquess who spoke last said a few words on the determination of His Majesty's Government not to proceed with Mr. Lyttelton's proposals. My noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, I think, sufficiently explained the reasons why we considered that particular form of government unsuitable to the present state of affairs. It may be true that there have been cases where, without very serious friction, representative government has formed a preliminary to responsible government. I do not know that any of those cases which the noble Marquess has quoted could be mentioned as thoroughly satisfactory; but, however that may be, in all those cases there was this marked difference from the present state of affairs, that those were communities in a more or less early state of development, while here we have to deal with communities which, though existing under changed conditions, had self-government before. We consider that beyond any system that could be devised, the system desired by Mr. Lyttelton depends on the absolute goodwill of all parties concerned in it, if it is to work at all. If, therefore, the noble Viscount who opened this debate, and others are correct—and I hope they are not entirely correct—in describing the state of feeling which exists in the two provinces, there would be, I think, considerably greater danger of real friction arising under the more modified scheme than under the full grant of responsible government.

The noble Viscount who opened the debate made a speech of great interest. I cannot help, however, regretting the note—the excessive note, as it seemed to us on this side of the House—of mistrust of the Dutch, not merely of a few Dutch, but of the Dutch as a race, which seemed to pervade the whole of the noble Viscount's speech. I very much doubt if the noble Viscount, himself, realised to what an extent that note in his speech impressed itself upon us on this side of the House. I cannot affect to be altogether surprised. The noble Viscount spoke of his reminiscences of South Africa. Many hard things have been said of him; I have no doubt many unjust things have been said of the noble Viscount; and perhaps it might be too much to expect him to regard this matter with a perfect absence of bias. But it certainly does not tend to diminish the difficulty of His Majesty's Government in dealing with this question when such a very warlike note, if I may use the phrase, is struck, as was struck by the noble Viscount in reference to the Dutch in the course of this debate.

I cannot help wishing that, amongst the high offices that the noble Viscount has occupied, he had at one time or other filled the post of Chief Secretary or Viceroy of Ireland. If he had held either of those posts he would have found—as many Chief Secretaries and Viceroys on both sides of politics have found—that their efforts to improve the condition of the people and to advance the material progress of Ireland have been continually hampered and thwarted—by what? By the existence of a state of feeling which had become ingrained in the people of Ireland, and had arisen out of attempts in the past to establish in a community of mixed blood, an absolute and unreasonable ascendancy for one race, even though that race be our own. The noble Viscount was good enough to say that he did not regard us on this Bench as pro-Boers. I am sorry he used the term; but, my Lords, we are not going to declare ourselves anti-Boers. What we desire is to do our best to weld the whole of that mixed community together as far as it can be done, proceeding on the lines of fairness and justice to all parties there.

As to the further question of the franchise, at this late hour I will not say more than that the noble Marquess was quite correct in the construction which he placed upon our intentions; we do require more time to consider this matter. We hope we have made it clear that we preserve an open mind as to what may prove to be the fairest and best method of dealing with what we admit to be a difficult question.

On the question of Chinese labour, Lord Harris spoke with some warmth, but with a conviction which I am sure impressed the House. He gave us an interesting account of the manner in which the word "compound" was used in relation to the diamond mines at Kimberley, and the gold mines at Johannesburg. At this hour, however, I will not go into that matter. But as the noble Marquess who has just spoken stated that we had shifted our position—I do not think that was actually the phrase he used—on the general question of Chinese labour and on the point of its servile tinge or flavour, or whatever word you may prefer to use, I think it right to say that I am not aware that we have in the slightest degree shifted our position in that respect. I personally have nothing to withdraw from what I said on platforms in the country on the subject, or what I said in this House.

What is the position of the Chinaman when he goes to South Africa? He is recruited in China and shipped off, having been told that he has engaged himself for mining in South Africa; but, as Lord Selborne has pointed out, although he is aware of that fact, it is undoubtedly equally true that as to what is meant by mining in South Africa, or what the actual conditions of mining there in many cases are, he has been found to be in the dark. That difficulty, the possible ignorance of the coolie as to what he was undertaking when he engaged himself, is met by the carefully-guarded scheme of repatriation which my noble friend behind me proposes. The noble Marquess opposite said that surely we would not allow any coolie to walk into an office, ask for £17 10s., and immediately demand to be taken back to China. It may not have occurred to the noble Marquess that it is by no means impossible to impose some exceedingly simple test, with which I need not trouble the House, of the *bona fides* of the coolie who declares himself desirous of returning home. As to the expense, the noble Marquess seems to assume that there will be an enormous number of Chinamen returning to China under this provision; but I thought that half the argument of noble Lords opposite was that the coolie was so well treated, and in altogether such a fortunate position, that he would be more likely to re-engage than to want to return to China. Noble Lords opposite cannot have it both ways. I quite admit that if there was a continual flow of coolies backwards and forwards there might be some risk of a coolie who had made a little more money than another desiring to go to China for a holiday and return again; but, as matters stand, no coolies are coming from China. Consequently any coolie who goes back must remain in a state of uncertainty as to whether he will return again, as that must depend upon the action of the Transvaal Government after it has received its grant of responsible government.

Then the coolie, having got to South Africa, is taken more or less as a prisoner through the Colony and placed on the Rand. When he is there he has no civil rights whatever. He is not a citizen of the country; he is a human automaton, with no more distinct rights than a beast of burden. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack pointed out that, in addition to this, he is one of the comparatively few people in the world with whom a refusal to work is not regarded as a breach of contract, but as a criminal offence. He is restricted to a very low grade of labour, whatever may be his skill and intelligence; he is unable to trade or settle in the country, and is liable to be forcibly deported at the end of his time. In addition to that, he is subjected to all those practical difficulties which have been so ably brought out by previous speakers—practical difficulties, in connection with the enforcement of discipline, of avoiding real cruelty, which has undoubtedly occurred in not a few instances.

I would remind noble Lords that you must have regard to the accumulative effect of these provisions in looking to the condition of the coolie. It is not an answer to say that one disability is shared by an Oxford undergraduate, a second by an Indian civil servant, or a third by a sailor under the Merchant Shipping Act. It is the effect of them all together which gives the servile tinge to the status of the man, and it is to that which we object. I ask noble Lords opposite, Would they be content to know that large numbers of British subjects, of any race or any blood under the British Crown, were going in thousands to serve in exactly this manner in a French, German, or Portuguese Colony? I do not for a moment believe that noble Lords would consider such a state of things otherwise than as a slight to the Empire. Then the noble Marquess found fault with my noble friend behind me for his use of the word "experiment." The noble Lord who spoke before the noble Marquess—Lord Montagu of Beaulieu—whom we were all glad to hear for the first time in this House, dwelt with considerable force upon what he believed to be the temporary character of this Chinese importation. I wish I could believe that this was merely a temporary expedient. But on the use of the word "experiment" I would simply say this, that it was only three or four months ago that Mr. Lyttelton suggested that the mine-owners would do very well to suspend, for six months or so, the importation of Chinese, on the ground, I suppose, that the experiment might be regarded as completed—that was how we took his suggestion—and that a sufficient number of Chinese had arrived. However, this belief in the servile tinge was half the cause of that agitation before and during the election which roused so much indignation in noble Lords opposite—the belief that this labour is not labour to which any free man ought to be put; and the other half was undoubtedly the feeling of disappointment on the part of the working classes of this country.

During the progress of the war I am perfectly certain that the working classes believed that we were acquiring a new white man's country. I never heard that any noble Lords opposite, or any members of the Conservative Party, with all their desire that on every occassion nothing should be spoken but the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, ever took the trouble to warn the working man of this country that what they were acquiring was, not a white man's country, but a country which, for labour purposes, might be regarded as tropical. I do not see how the working classes could be expected to know that of themselves. There is no climatic difficulty in the way of white men working in any industry in Johannesburg. How were the working classes to know that the labour conditions there would not be those of Canada or Australia, but would be those of the Straits Settlements or British Guiana? Just compare the conditions for a moment. In the Straits Settlement you have a population of about 5,000 Europeans to 580,000 Asiatics—one to 100. In British Guiana you have a European population of 17,000 and a mixed Asiatic and African population of 280,000—one to seventeen. In the Transvaal you have got a white population of some 300,000 and a native population of something under 1,000,000—rather more than one to three. Just think of the difference in those proportions of white men to coloured men, when you are told that the labour conditions of all three are precisely identical; and to that proportion of one to three you are going to add 50,000, 60,000, or, as some people hope and believe, as many as 150,000 Chinese, thus further diminishing the proportion between white and coloured in your newly acquired Colony.

I have always been one of those who have based their principal objection to this importation of Chinese labour even more on its effect upon the Colony and employers than on the position of labourers themselves. It is a disastrous thing for a large community of whites to depend, if it can possibly be helped, on coloured labour. It would be a still more disastrous thing if the Colony came to consist of an enormous number of coloured labourers with a small luxurious managing class of whites. That is a misfortune which might be avoided by a little more patience and willingness not to go quite so fast. This last observation brings me to the grave reflection suggested in the latter part of the speech of the noble Marquess, as to some interference with the choice of the Transvaal, when it receives responsible government, in this matter of Chinese labour. The Colony will have to make its own choice —the choice of Hercules — a choice between the easier, pleasanter path of importing Asiatics by the 100,000, or the, I venture to think, saner, nobler path of slower development through the resources of the country itself.

Is it so absolutely certain that this feverishly rapid development of Johannesburg is an unmixed advantage to the Transvaal? In Johannesburg there are two distinct classes of inhabitants, just as there are two distinct classes of mine-owners. There is an industrial class and a purely gambling class. One of the soundest, certainly one of the most shrewd and best-informed, opinions that we have had has been to the effect that it is a great misfortune at Johannesburg that so many men think so very much less of the output of gold on a particular mine, than of whether the shares of that mine are going up or down. That surely is not a healthy state of things. Lord Harris and a subsequent speaker complained that the mine owners had been spoken of unjustly because they dug out gold and not coal. There is no foundation for that statement. The hard things that have been said about Johannesburg mine-owners have been said of the gambling element connected with the mines. The noble Earl opposite, who made a very interesting speech from the banking point of view, forgot to state that the interest which was put forward as being pathetically demanded by poor investors was interest, not on what can properly be called the real capital of the mines, but on a capital six, seven, or eight times the amount of their real capital, floated on the market very often by unscrupulous people, and bought by these poor investors. I am sorry for the investors, but to say that in order to protect them you must employ a new class of labour in a manner which you think improper seems to me a very large order indeed. I think you could find many mines in this country, thin-seam coal mines and others, which paid their share-holders very little return. They were poor men also and received very little interest, or none at all; but it has never been suggested that on that account you must necessarily engage cheap foreign labour in order to secure these people from loss over their investments.

THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER: If the noble Earl is referring to me, I should like to say that the remark which I made was that the mines only produced 25 per cent. of the cost of their capitalisation, not the capitalisation which the Stock Exchange put on them, but the capitalisation of equipment.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I was not alluding to what the noble Marquess said, but to the speech of Lord Harrowby, who stated the case of the poor investor. I repeat, is it a certainty that it is for the best permanent interest of such a Colony as the Transvaal that this industry should be forced on by artificial means rather than be kept steadily going with such labour as the country can produce? Noble Lords opposite talk as if there was no native labour and nothing but Chinese. There is as much native labour now as there was before the war, and it is not by any means certain, setting aside the question of white labour, which I do not want to argue now, that a better supply of native labour could not be obtained at Johannesburg. Not long ago I had a conversation with a gentleman who knows the natives well. He told me that many of the Kaffir chiefs had informed him that if the conditions at Johannesburg were like those at the De Beers Mines, where the natives no doubt are treated exceedingly well, and, as I believe, are perfectly contented, a great deal more Kaffir labour might be obtained than was obtained at the present moment.

The choice between the two roads must lie with the Colony when it gets responsible Government. But there is a point when Imperial considerations must, in our view, over-ride even the express wishes of any responsibly governed Colony. The noble Marquess asked me whether objection would be taken to this or that provision in the Ordinance, if we had to consider it, in giving a grant of responsible government. I am not prepared to say that any provision of an Ordinance ought necessarily to be struck out because we did not happen to like it; but if there was a provision in the proposed Ordinance which we considered, taking the evidence as a whole, to be inconsistent with that due amount of personal freedom which in our opinion every subject of His Majesty ought to enjoy, we should disallow that provision. Let me give an instance. When the first Ordinance came to England there was no provision for the transfer of the labourer from one mine to another without his consent, but in its revised condition that provision appeared. Mr. Lyttelton in reply to a Question in the House of Commons—I am speaking from memory—did not, I think, state that the provision would be struck out, but implied that he saw strong objections to it. However, that provision for the transfer of the coolie, without his consent, was submitted with others to the Chinese Minister for his views. The Chinese Minister said that in his opinion the effect of the provision would be to treat the Chinaman like a chattel or article of commerce, and consequently it was struck out of the Ordinance. I have always thought it a rather lamentable thing that a provision which, I think the noble Viscount will not correct me in saying, was somewhat strongly pressed from the Transvaal, should have had to be withdrawn owing to the fact that the standard of human liberty insisted on by the Chinese Minister was higher than that upon which those who framed the Ordinance were prepared to recognise. If such a provision reappeared in the Ordinance to be approved under the grant of responsible government, I have no doubt His Majesty's present Ministers would insist on its being withdrawn.

That statement as to the general Imperial standard of freedom is not in any way specially aimed at the Transvaal or at the Johannesburg millionaires, or at any class of people. It would be equally applicable to any self-governing colony under the Crown. What we do say is that although one colony may like to employ one form of labour, and another colony another form, yet there is a general minimum standard of liberty which must be maintained for all His Majesty's subjects all over the world, and which the Home Government will not allow to be compromised. We do not disguise from ourselves the great difficulties which surround the task we have to undertake in South Africa. Nobody, I am perfectly certain, is more aware of those difficulties than my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies. People who have never had anything to do with politics or with administration are sometimes apt to talk as though there was a choice between a right course and a wrong one, and it was merely a question whether you took the right path in one direction, or the wrong path in another. Noble Lords opposite who have had to do with affairs know that that is not the case. You are more often confronted with situations in which every alternative offers difficulties of considerable substance; and we do not for a moment deny that there are many difficulties surrounding any solution of this question. But we do hope that by adherence to the principles which have been impressed on the House in the course of this debate by my noble friend behind me and by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, we shall be able to achieve such a measure of success as may in the end justify us in what I fully admit to be a bold course of action.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock a.m., to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 27th February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Hants (Northern or Basingstoke Division), in the room of the right hon. Arthur Frederick Jeffreys, deceased. — (*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Derby Gas Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill; Southampton Gas Bill; Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.:—Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill; London Electric Supply Corporation Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill; to be read a second time upon Monday next.

Burry Port Gas and Improvement Bill; Pontefract Corporation Bill; Read a second time and committed.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill; Read a second time, and committed.

Huddersfield Corporation Bill [by order]; Read a second time and committed.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill [by order]; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill [by order]; Read a second time, and committed.

West Middlesex Roads Bill [by order]; Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Leigh; and, Widnes; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Report on the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Colleges of Science and of Art, the Geological Survey and Museum, and on the work of the Solar Physics Committee for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Copy presented, of Scheme under the Acts for the Management of the Crewkerne Grammer School Foundation, in the parish of Crewkerne, in the county of Somerset, founded by John Combe in or about the year 1499, regulated by a Scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts on 21st July 1876, as altered by Schemes of the Charity Commissioners of 30th November 1877 and 23rd February 1883, and as amended by a Scheme made under the said Acts on 3rd October 1895 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Tables showing the extent in statute acres and the produce of the Crops for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (PROVISIONAL ORDERS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, and The General Pier and Harbour Act (1861) Amendment Act, Session 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 61.)

NOTICE OF ACCIDENTS BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatory of the objects of the Notice of Accidents Bill."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 62.)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Men Employed Building "Dreadnought" and "Britannia."

MR. BELLAIRS (King's Lynn): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, what was the average number of men employed per week in building the battleships "Dreadnought" and "Britannia" at Portsmouth since 1st October, 1905, and what number worked overtime in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The proportion of labour employed on the "Britannia" and "Dreadnought," respectively, since 1st October has been 1 to 2·01. Practically no overtime has been worked on the "Britannia," as the time originally fixed for her completion, and the consequent contractors' dates for supply of material, fittings, etc., rendered it unnecessary; but she is in advance of her time, and will probably be ready two months earlier than the official date originally fixed for her completion. No reason existed in the case of the "Britannia" (being the last ship of an approved type) for asking the contractors to anticipate their contract dates for delivery of material, or for their work on the ship, hence there was no necessity for special overtime; but in the case of the "Dreadnought," the first vessel of an entirely new and very novel type, the Board of Admiralty decided, in order to try her at sea as soon as possible, to use every effort for her completion with the utmost despatch. With that object a large number of men, about two-thirds of the labour, employed on such work as the riveting of the hull and preparing of the launching ways, etc., have been working overtime, with the result that the ship will be completed for sea in advance of her original date, and at less cost than anticipated. It is not proposed, nor will it be necessary to have recourse to any such special efforts in future vessels, but in the case of the "Dreadnought" it was essential, in the interests of the public service, to take steps for getting her quickly to sea; very satisfactory results have thus been obtained, both in economy of construction and in rapidity of completion. The "Dreadnought" will probably be ready for sea in about fifteen months from the date of laying the keel.

Sale of English Line of Nile Steamers to German Company.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will consider the advisability of making inquiry respecting the sale and transfer of the English line of steamers on the Nile to a German Company, with the view to taking steps to see that the interests of this country in Egypt are not prejudiced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) We understand that the Hamburg-American Steamship Company has joined with the Anglo-American Nile Steamer and Hotel Company in establishing a service of steamers on the Nile, and that the new Company will be known as the Hamburg and Anglo-American Nile Company. The establishment of this Company does not appear to be open to any objection, and the matter is not one in which any inquiry on the part of His Majesty's Government would seem to be necessary or in which they could interfere.

Decoration of Outer Lobby.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): To ask the First Commissioner of Works, when it is proposed to complete the decorative work by filling in the two vacant panels in the Outer Lobby.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) No provision for this work has been made in the ensuing year's Estimates, and I cannot undertake under present financial conditions to ask for funds for merely decorative purposes.

Effect of Restriction of Importation of Live Cattle on Prices of Beef and Mutton.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he has any official information showing the average prices of beef and mutton respectively in the United Kingdom prior to and since the year 1896, when restrictions were placed upon the importation of live cattle into this country; and whether the Agricultural Department has prepared any index numbers by which a comparison may be made between the variations in the prices of beef and mutton and those of commodities generally, say, during the past thirty years.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) No official information is available to show the average prices of beef and mutton in the United Kingdom for the period to which the hon. Member refers, but the following table gives the average prices of cattle and sheep in the Metropolitan Meat Market for the years 1880–1892 and 1893–1905. The year 1892 has been taken, for the reason that Canadian cattle were first subjected to the requirement of slaughter at the port of landing in that year, although the requirement was not made a statutory one until 1896.

Average Prices of British Cattle and Sheep per eight pounds, sinking the offal, at the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

Period.	Cattle.			Sheep.		
	Inferior Quality.	Second Quality.	First Quality.	Inferior Quality.	Second Quality.	First Quality.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1880–1892	3 5	4 8	5 3	4 7	5 8	6 3
1893–1905	2 8	3 11	4 7	3 7	5 0	5 9

The Board of Trade have been good enough to supply index numbers as to the prices of beef and mutton since the year 1871, from which it appears, taking that year as a base (100), the mean index numbers for beef and mutton are 97·3 and 105·5 for the period 1880–1892, and 85·3 and 96·9 for the period 1893–1905.

The following Table gives the figures for each year from 1872 to 1895.

	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.
Beef - -	103·1	114·0	110·9	114·7	111·6	110·1	111·6
Mutton -	105·6	113·4	97·2	116·9	118·3	116·9	115·5

	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.
Beef - -	102·3	110·1	102·3	111·6	113·2	107·0	97·7
Mutton -	111·3	115·5	114·1	121·1	122·5	108·5	95·8

	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.
Beef - -	89·9	82·2	91·5	89·9	89·9	91·5	88·4
Mutton -	101·4	88·7	98·6	107·0	105·6	98·6	94·4

	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.
Beef - -	88·4	83·7	83·7	82·2	83·7	79·1	83·7
Mutton - -	91·5	98·6	100·0	91·5	95·8	93·0	95·8

	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Beef - -	89·9	85·3	91·5	86·8	85·3	85·3
Mutton - -	101·4	95·8	97·2	98·6	100·0	100·0

Removal of H.M.S. "Satellite" from the Tyne.

MR. H. J. CRAIG (Tynemouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, having regard to the fact that the contemplated removal of H.M.S. "Satellite" from the Tyne will not only inflict inconvenience on the men of the Royal Naval Reserve resident on Tyneside, but also deprive an important port of a ship which is extensively used, both as a recruiting depôt for His Majesty's Navy, and as a drill ship for naval reserves of all classes, he will consider the desirability of retaining her in commission for a further period.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Admiralty have decided to lend H.M.S. "Satellite" to the Tyneside Division of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, on the understanding that the expense of her upkeep and maintenance, together with any dock dues and local charges that may be levied, will be borne by the funds of the Division.

Day of Rest for Metropolitan Policemen.

Mr. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if legislation is required to give the Metropolitan Police one day's rest in seven instead of one day's rest in fourteen as now prevails.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The leave of Metropolitan Police is not regulated by Statute, and could no doubt be altered without legislation; but I may say that the alteration suggested in the Question would involve a very large augmentation of the force, and that the cost would be so great that it could not be met without exceeding the limit of 9d. fixed by The Police Act, 1868, to the Metropolitan Police Rate.

Equalisation of Rates Bill—Area Affected.

Mr. THORNE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will, when drafting the Equalisation of Rates Bill, make it apply to the whole of the Metropolitan Police area.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) It is proposed that the Bill should provide for an amendment of The London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894. Hence it must necessarily be limited to the Metropolis.

Old Age Pensions and Indoor Relief.

Mr. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can give any information as to the approximate cost of maintaining the aged poor of the United Kingdom over sixty-five years of age by means of indoor and outdoor relief; and what is the average cost per head respectively of the two methods of relief.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I regret that I am not able to give the information asked for, and I fear that it would not be practicable to obtain it. The jurisdiction of the Local Government Board only extends to England and Wales, so that my Answer must be taken as applying only to that part of the United Kingdom.

Indian Staff Corps Officers—Place of Residence awaiting Compulsory Retirement.

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to a recent ruling of the Government of India to the effect that officers of the Indian Staff Corps who entered the Indian Army on or after the 1st July 1881 shall, on vacating employment, be allowed the option of residing in or out of India until compulsory retirement on account of age; while residing in India officers will receive the pay of their rank, and while residing out of India they will be allowed to take any furlough admissible under the 1886 Leave Rules, and receive unemployed pay at the rate of £500 a year; whether, under this ruling officers who joined after 1st July 1881, and, in consequence of having won the distinction of early commands, are obliged by the rules to vacate their commands for a more or less considerable time before their compulsory retirement, are forced to choose between spending the time in India or accepting £200 per annum less if they wish to spend it at home; and whether in view of the fact that officers who joined before the 1st July 1881 could elect on the termination of their commands, to reside in or out of India on the furlough to which they were entitled, furlough pay being £600 per annum for officers of from twenty-four to twenty-nine years' service and £700 for those of twenty-nine and onwards, he will explain why this difference is made in the case of the officer who joined in 1881 and after between the pay they receive in India and in England while they are awaiting their compulsory retirement after relinquishing their commands, and say whether the ruling above quoted can be reconsidered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The right of residing in or out of India after vacation of appointment has been extended to the officers who entered the Indian Army after the 1st July 1881. The conditions are, as regards officers under the Leave Rules of 1886, correctly stated in the second clause of the Question. As regards the remainder of the Question, I must explain that the officers appointed to the Indian Army before the 1st July 1881 possessed a prescriptive right to remain in the Service and a certain claim to continous employment; and, when the latter was taken from them in 1881 (on the occasion of the limitation of tenure of regimental command), they necessarily retained the right of residence in India on Indian pay. To these officers, at the time, was given the option of remaining in India on this pay or of completing their service at home on furlough pay, *i.e.*, half Indian pay, or (during the period 1881–86) about £400 a year. In 1886 new Leave Rules came into force, and officers who elected those Rules necessarily became entitled to leave pay under them in place of their furlough pay under the older Rules. The above concession was expressly limited to the officers who entered before the 1st July 1881. The other officers have no right to remain indefinitely in the Service, and they were appointed after the limitation of tenure of command had been introduced, and therefore they have not the same claim to special treatment as those officers whose conditions of service had been changed for the worse by the limitation. They have not hitherto been allowed the concession of completing their service for higher pensions after becoming unemployed, though the Regulations have contained a rate of unemployed pay applicable to them, viz., £360 a year, wherever residing, and it has no doubt been understood that they would not be compelled to retire before attaining the age for superannuation. My predecessor decided that the rate of £365 a year was insufficient, and fixed the unemployed pay at Indian pay while residing in India, and a special rate of £500 residing out of India for officers of over twenty-four years' service, and subject to the Leave Rules of 1886. I may add that £500 a year is the unemployed pay of a major-general, and that it would be unsuitable that general officers should draw smaller unemployed pay than officers of inferior rank. Officers under the Furlough Rules of 1875 are entitled to half Indian pay only while residing at home, whether they entered the Indian Army before or after 1st July 1881. I see no reason for reconsidering my predecessor's decision.

Army Candidates and Irish Tailors.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the complaint of the Irish tailors that candidates for Army appointments almost invariably obtain their uniforms and outfits in London; whether he is aware that the military authorities furnish the candidates with official papers indicating different places in London to purchase their uniforms and outfits; and whether he will make inquiry, and arrange that Dublin and London shall be put upon equal terms in regard to such supplies.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The selection of a tailor in Ireland, as in England, is left entirely to the discretion of the individual officers who deal with them. Candidates on passing are informed officially by the War Office that they can have forwarded on application the price lists of all those firms in Great Britain and Ireland who have availed themselves of the opportunity of submitting their lists to the War Office for the provision of officers' outfits on cash terms. The reason of this practice on the part of the War Office is that it is attempting to insure moderation in charges. Commanding officers are, however, forbidden to order any young officer to purchase his uniform from any particular tailor.

Irish Board of Agriculture—Position of Mr. Porter.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether Mr. Porter, of the Board of Agriculture, Dublin, was originally employed in the Army or Navy; whether he was in the employment of the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, for how long, and at what salary; how long and at what salary was he in the employment of the Land Commission; and whether Mr. Porter has been employed in any other Government Department in Ireland or England.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Mr. Porter was formerly a sub-lieutenant in the Navy, from which service he retired with a pension of £45 12*s.* 6*d.* He has been continuously in the employment of the Irish Government since 24th November 1887, when he was appointed as Lay Assistant Commissioner under the Land Acts. His salary in that position was £800, including subsistence allowance. His qualifications are stated in Parliamentary Paper 177, of 1891. On 21st December 1891, Mr. Porter was appointed to be

Superintendent of the Agricultural Department of the Land Commission, at a salary of £1,000, including subsistence allowance. Whilst so employed his services were utilised, from 1892, in connection with the operations of the Congested Districts Board for the improvement of agriculture in the Congested Districts. His salary was borne on the Vote for the Land Commission, which department, at that time, managed the Congested Districts Board's agricultural operations. In 1900, Mr. Porter was transferred to the Department of Agriculture in pursuance of Section 22 (1) of the Act establishing the Department; but he continued to be employed upon the work of the Congested Districts Board up to the 31st March 1904. During the two latter years of such service one-half of Mr. Porter's salary was defrayed by the Congested Districts Board, the remainder being borne by the Department of Agriculture. A reduction from Mr. Porter's salary of the amount of his naval pension has been made throughout his service. I have no information that Mr. Porter was ever employed in any Government Department in England.

Speech by Colonel Davies at Dinner of Imperial Light Horse.

Mr. ALDEN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the speech made on the 29th January, by Colonel W. T. F. Davies, at the annual dinner of the Imperial Light Horse, in which speech the Prime Minister and his colleagues were spoken of in terms of opprobrium; whether Lord Selborne was present on that occasion; and whether he made any remonstrance at the use of such language.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State has noticed the report of the speech to which the hon. Member refers. It is very natural that persons of excitable character who apprehend that their monetary interests may be prejudicially affected by the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to Chinese labour should express themselves strongly, particularly after dinner. The Secretary of State does not propose to attach undue importance to such criticism; though it be regretted that Lord Selborne should have been subjected to the annoyance of hearing it offered in his presence.

Army Clothing Contracts.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will grant a Return from the Army Clothing Department depôt ofthe total cost of material issued for any contract to the contractor, and the total amount received by the contractor for the same clothing.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I fear the mischief arising from the publication of the information asked for would probably exceed the good which might result. There is, however, another mode of dealing with the evil which I think the hon. Member has in view. This mode the War Office is about to adopt as the result of a conference held last week with a labour deputation, which approached the War Office and the Admiralty on this and other subjects. If the hon. Member will speak to me privately I will tell him what steps are being taken.

Mr. NICHOLLS: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will grant a return from the Army Clothing Department depôt of clothing made at their factory, and compare cost with that made by contractors.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The full details as to the cost of clothing made in the Royal Army Clothing Factory will be found in the accounts of that establishment which are annually presented to Parliament. The further point raised by this Question falls within the Answer which I have already given to the hon. Member.

Sittings of Foreign and Colonial Legislatures.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, if he can, in reply to this Question or by the issue of a Parliamentary Paper, state the daily hours and annual periods during which the representative chambers of the United States, of the principal European countries, of Japan, and of our self-governing Colonies meet in session, *i.e.*, the approximate dates in the year when they are usually convened and discharged from their duties, and the hours of the day when such respective bodies ordinarily meet and adjourn; whether he can give similar information in the case of the House of Commons, say from the middle of the eighteenth century up to the present time; and, if it is not practicable to fully furnish this information without undue trouble and delay, will he give such of it as is more readily available to Government officials.

(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The information asked for in the first part of this Question will be found in Parliamentary Paper Cd. 907. With reference to the duration of daily and yearly sittings of the House of Commons, I will see whether a Paper can be laid giving the greater part at least of the information required.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Discharges of Government Dockyard Workmen.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is proposed to re-engage the workmen recently discharged from Government dockyards.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): As far as the requirements of the dockyards can be foreseen at present, it is not anticipated that there will be any opportunity to re-enter the workmen recently discharged.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Is it the intention of the Admiralty to discharge any men from the dockyards in March next?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I must ask for notice of that question.

General Ian Hamilton's Book.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he authorised General Sir Ian Hamilton to publish a book upon the Russo-Japanese War.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): The book in question was published before the present Government came into office. I had personally nothing to do with it.

Soldiers in Civil Prisons.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the number of soldiers, if any, now incarcerated in civil prisons undergoing punishment for military offences, and the number of soldiers now undergoing punishment in civil prisons for civil offences; and whether any soldiers are now undergoing punishment in civil prisons whose sentence does not carry with it discharge from the Army.

MR. HALDANE: The number of soldiers in civil prisons for military offences is twenty-one, and for civil offences 252. There are sixty-seven soldiers in civil prisons whose sentence does not carry with it discharge from the Army

Australian Colonies and Irish Home Rule.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the petition to His Majesty in favour of self-government for Ireland, passed by the Commonwealth of Australia Federal Parliament, has been received; whether it will be printed and circulated for the information of Members of this House; and also whether a Resolution of similar character has been received from the West Australian Parliament.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): An address to the King from the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth in favour of granting Home Rule to Ireland, and a Resolution of the Commonwealth Senate to the same effect have been received. The Secretary of State has not received any similar Resolution from the Parliament of Western Australia. I shall be very glad to lay the Resolutions on the Table of the House.

Kaffir Labour at Transvaal Mines.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of Kaffir labourers employed in the Transvaal mines at the close of each of the years 1901–2–3–4 respectively and for each of the months of the year 1905 separately, so far as he has the facts.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The number of Kaffir labourers in the Transvaal in employment on last day of each month were as follows:—

December, 1901	15,306
December, 1902	45,698
December, 1903	73,622
December, 1904	83,639
January, 1905	89,895
February, 1905	97,882
March, 1905	105,184
April, 1905	107,756
May, 1905	106,864
June, 1905	104,902
July, 1905	103,623
August, 1905	100,081
September, 1905	97,721
October, 1905	96,392
November, 1905	96,283
December, 1905	93,831

Mr. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Is it not the fact that Kaffir labour was steadily increasing until it was gradually displaced by Chinese labour?

*Mr. CHURCHILL asked for notice of the Question.

Cape Colony Franchise.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether coloured persons in Cape Colony are admitted to the franchise on the same terms as whites, and how many natives, British Indians, and other coloured persons are entitled to exercise the franchise.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The number of natives on the list of voters in 1902 was 19,505, of British Indians 399, of Malays 747, and of Chinese 67.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the population in the Transvaal of natives, of British Indians, and of other coloured persons, respectively; whether all these persons pay taxes for the support of the Colony; and what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take to secure representation for these persons in any Constitution that may be granted to the Colony.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The population of aboriginal natives in the Transvaal in April, 1904, was 945, 498: the number of all other coloured persons including British Indians, was 23,891. They all pay taxes. In accordance with the terms of surrender, the question of granting the franchise to natives will not be decided until after the introduction of self-government.

Mr. HAROLD COX asked whether the term "natives" in the Vereeniging Treaty had any relation to British Indians.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: I supposed it covered all but Europeans; but I will look into the point.

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

*Colonel LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the reasonable amount of notice required before a Chinese coolie can obtain leave to be repatriated at Government expense.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: It is not yet possible to make a statement on this matter. The regulations are being carefully considered.

Transvaal Elections.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when it is expected that the elections in the Transvaal will take place.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The elections in the Transvaal cannot conveniently take place until the form of Constitution, the basis of the franchise and other fundamental questions have been determined, and the Secretary of State is not yet in a position to name a date.

Transvaal Labour Ordnance.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the regulations by which Chinese coolies are kept in compounds are to be rescinded.

*MR. CHURCHILL: It is not at present proposed to rescind the regulations of the first Labour Ordinance by which the Chinese coolies are kept within the premises of the mines. They are not kept in compounds.

Natal Disturbances.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any official information showing that, in relation to some disturbances in Natal, the kraals and crops of the natives implicated have been destroyed; and, if so, can he say how many women and children were rendered homeless and foodless by this action.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I have no information, official or other, to this effect.

Orange River Colony Franchise.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the conditions of electoral franchise in the Orange River Colony will be the same as those conferred on the Transvaal.

*MR. CHURCHILL: This Question is among those which are now under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, and concerning which it is proposed to obtain further information.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony Population.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the adult male population of the British and Dutch races, respectively, in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

*MR. CHURCHILL: I am unable to give figures. The census does not make any distinction between races of European origin.

MR. HICKS BEACH: Will you take steps to get the information?

*MR. CHURCHILL: This is among the subjects as to which the Government propose to make inquiry.

Gold Output in the Transvaal.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total value of the gold output for the months of December in each of the years 1901-2-3-4, respectively, and for each of the months of 1905 separately, so far as he has the facts.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The figures are as follows: Value of gold output in Transvaal—

	£
December 1901	224,692
December 1902	832,652
December 1903	1,215,111
December 1904	1,538,377
January 1905	1,578,847
February ,,	1,557,291
March ,,	1,699,991
April ,,	1,712,071
May ,,	1,767,438
June ,,	1,760,044
July ,,	1,778,112
August ,,	1,836,172
September ,,	1,763,973
October ,,	1,768,798
November ,,	1,799,595
December ,,	1,833,295

Northern Nigeria Disturbances.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any further authentic information to give about the disaster in Northern Nigeria; and whether any punitive expedition will be necessary.

*MR. CHURCHILL: In telegram, dated February 16th and received at the Colonial Office on the 20th, Sir Frederick Lugard, the High Commissioner, stated that a Mahdi had arisen near Sokoto and had completely defeated one company of (native) mounted infantry on February 14th; and that three British officers, mentioned by name, were reported killed. Of these, two were civilians and one a military officer. One medical officer was severely wounded. A further telegram has now been received from the High Commissioner reporting as follows:—"Further news from Burdon, Sokoto, states no room for hope that either of three British officers living; position of garrison quite safe, awaiting arrival of reinforcements; 150 will arrive about February 28th; local chiefs loyally co-operating in suppression. Disaster due to horses bolting, breaking square. Total native troops reported killed, twenty-five. Position of affairs gives me much less anxiety." So far as Lord Elgin can judge, the circumstances are not such as will necessarily call for a punitive expedition in the ordinary sense, but it will doubtless be necessary to reinforce the troops in the district and to take measures to arrest and punish the promoters of the disturbance. A further telegram has been received to-day from Sir F. Lugard saying that he has heard from Major Burdon that all the white men in or near Sokoto are safe except those already reported killed.

Physical Deterioration Committee's Report.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the recommendation of the Physical Deterioration (1904) Committee to the effect that a Bill should be brought before Parliament at an early date, having for its object the prohibition of the sale of tobacco and cigarettes to children below a certain age; and whether he is now in a position to say that this recommendation will be acted upon in the present session.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am aware of the recommendation in the Report of the Physical Deterioration Committee, and I will give the matter my careful consideration; but I am not yet in a position to make any statement as to legislation.

Licensing Act—Compensation Return.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will present a Return giving such information as to the operation of the Licensing Act, 1904, during the year 1905 as he is empowered to require from compensation authorities under the seventh section of that Act.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have in preparation, and hope to issue before very long, a volume of licensing statistics. This will include the information asked for by the hon. Member, among much other material which will, I hope, be found useful.

Examination for Factory Inspectors.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the fact that neither the preliminary nor the final examination for the office of factory inspector includes, as obligatory subjects, hygiene, chemistry, machine construction and drawing, applied mechanics, steam, and electricity; and whether, in the interest of efficient factory inspection, he can give any promise that the present form of the examinations referred to shall be revised.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The present scheme of examination for factory inspectorships is the result of a recent revision, the object of which was to bring it more into accord with the ascertained needs of the Factory Department. Those needs are so diverse in their character that technical and scientific training, valuable as it is, is not, taken alone, found to be sufficient to make a good inspector. Thoroughly good general abilities are always required, and the object of the present scheme of examination has been to obtain such men, by drawing upon as wide a field as possible of candidates with the best modern education which the country affords. The hon. Member will not have failed to notice that candidates of technical and scientific attainments are provided with an entry to the inspectorate by the inclusion of chemistry, physics and practical mechanism among the optional subjects of examination, while sanitary science is made an obligatory subject in the deferred examination; the reason being that this subject is found to be most thoroughly acquired in the course of the actual work of inspection. The highly technical questions connected with the use of electricity in factories are now dealt with by an electrical inspector specially appointed for that purpose. I do not therefore think that any further alteration in this examination is required, but should experience of its results show that modifications are necessary, I shall be prepared to make them.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: Is it not a fact that, according to definition, factories are places where power is used, and should not, therefore, a candidate for examination have the requisite knowledge of power?

MR. J. R. MACDONALD (Leicester) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed to use the January syllabus for the next examination?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I think it will be used. In the last two or three days I have been asked to give a definite and final opinion on this matter. As, however, the question has been under consideration for fifteen months I am not prepared to give a final answer after fifteen days consideration of the subject. I will see how the system works and then form my own opinion.

West Yorkshire Police and Passive Resisters' Goods.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that the police of the West Riding of Yorkshire are making a charge of one shilling daily for the storage of passive resisters' goods; under what authority they make such a charge; will he give directions for the return of the charges thus made; whether they have his sanction as being in accordance with the scale of charges fixed by the Act, 57 Geo. 3., cap. 93.

*MR. GLADSTONE: On the 11th January, 1905, a table of fees payable to constables of the West Riding of Yorkshire, containing a fee of one shilling per day for keeping possession of goods under distraint, was submitted by the Standing Joint Committee and approved by the Secretary of State acting under the powers given to him by section 23 of the Police Act, 1890. A legal question has since been raised, namely, whether the scale of charges fixed by the Distress (Costs) Act, 1817, (57 Geo. III., cap. 93), as extended by the Distress (Costs) Act, 1826, (7 and 8 Geo. IV., cap. 17) applies in certain cases to the exclusion of the fees approved under the Police Act, 1890. This question can only be determined by the courts of law, and I have no power to decide it or to give any directions of the nature suggested. I understand that the question has actually come before a county court, and that there is to be an appeal to the High Court.

Alien Immigration Boards and the Press.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the representatives of the public Press are admitted to attend the proceedings of the Alien Immigration Boards; and, if not, whether he will take steps to assure such admission if desired.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I believe that in most cases, if not in all, the representatives of the public Press have not been admitted to attend the proceedings of the Immigration Boards. This is a matter which, with other points of procedure as settled by my predecessor, has been left by the regulations to the discretion of the Boards. It is engaging my attention.

Maintenance of Parents—Imprisonment for Non-Payment.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that two labourers living at Wrangley, in Lincolnshire, named Harry Blythe and Charles Blythe, have been committed to prison for twenty-one days, for failing to obey the order of the guardians of the Boston Union, each to contribute 1s. a week to the guardians for the maintenance of their parent, and to obey the order of the magistrates to pay 2s. 6d. a week each for arrears; and whether, seeing that three out of the five magistrates of the North Holland Bench sitting at Boston, who made the order to commit, were Members of the Board of Guardians that prosecuted the case, he proposes, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent magistrates adjudicating in cases in which they are so interested.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have made inquiry in the case and am informed that of the magistrates who issued the committal orders two were guardians. There appears to have been sufficient evidence that the defendants, neither of whom was married, were in a position to pay the monies due from them in respect of their mother's maintenance. The two guardians who adjudicated in the case appear not to have been more interested than any other ratepayers would be in recovering the debt due to the common fund of the Union; and the facts at present before me do not suggest the desirability of any new legislation on the subject.

Administration of the Housing Acts.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether certain members of the staff of the Local Government Board devote their whole time to the administration of the Housing Acts, or whether the administration of the Housing Acts is carried out by members of the staff to whom is allocated other work connected with the Local Government Board.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The work devolving on the Local Government Board under the Housing of the Working Classes Acts is, together with other sanitary business, dealt with in the Sanitary Administration Department of the Office. No members of the staff of the Board are required to devote their whole time to this work.

British Insurance Companies—Suggested Official Audit.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the advisability of arranging an annual official audit of the manner, and securities, in which the capital funds of British insurance companies are invested; whether he will also enquire into the expediency of establishing a Government guaranteed insurance company enabling a moderate system of premiums for fire, life and accident upon the lines of an institution carried on by the responsible Government in the New Zealand Colony.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon, Boroughs): I fear I am not at the moment in a position to advise the adoption of either of the very far-reaching proposals suggested by my hon. friend.

MR. FIELD: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the point in the immediate future, seeing that this plan has been adopted in New Zealand?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There is a good deal to be said for the first Question. I will consider it carefully.

Merchant Shipping Bill.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when he proposes to introduce the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am still in communication with representatives of the shipping interest on one or two points I wish to elicit their views on, before the draft is finally settled, but I hope to be able to introduce the Bill in the course of the next few days.

Cleator Moor Postal Service.

MR. FULLERTON (Cumberland, Egremont): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will accelerate the mails to and from Cleator Moor, Egremont, Frizington, and other places in that neighbourhood, to enable the population in that district to receive their letters and communications before nine and ten o'clock each morning.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Some inquiry has recently been made on this subject, but it was found that certain proposals made by the District Councils concerned were impracticable. I am, however, considering whether the object in view can be attained in any other way.

Irish National Schools—Building Plans.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a decision has been arrived at in the matter of the new plans for building national schools in Ireland; and, if so, whether he can say when the details of these plans will be published.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The matter is still under consideration.

Epizootic Abortion in Cattle.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what progress has been made by the Departmental Committee on epizootic abortion in cattle; whether any interim Report will be issued; and whether any systematic inquiries have been made to ascertain the prevalence of the disease at the present time and during, say, the past ten years.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) : The Committee have obtained the use of suitable laboratory accommodation in the neighbourhood of London, where scientific experiments are being carried out with the object of determining whether epizootic abortion is contagious, and, if so, the nature of the contagion, and the manner in which the disease spreads. It is not proposed to issue an interim Report. No systematic inquiries as to the prevalence of the disease have yet been made, but there is no doubt that it is the cause of very considerable loss to stockowners, and that outbreaks are of frequent occurrence.

Cahersavane—Clooghvoola Road.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that application has been previously made to the Congested Districts Board for assistance in the construction of a road from Cahersavane to Clooghvoola, in the rural district of Caherciveen; and whether, seeing that its construction is urgently required, the Congested Districts Board will now undertake it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): In October last the Board postponed the consideration of the application referred to until some members of the Board should inspect the route. No opportunity for such inspection has since occurred, but the first convenient occasion will be taken.

Clare Land Commission.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the next Sitting of the head Land Commission will be held in County Clare.

MR. BRYCE: The date has not yet been arranged, but the matter will come up for consideration by the Judicial Commissioner concerned on his return from circuit.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in many districts in Ireland cases have been listed for five years before being heard?

MR. BRYCE: I am not aware of that fact.

Irish Police and the Dungannon Club, Carrickmore.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of placards, giving notice of a lecture about to be recently given in Dungannon Club, Carrickmore, were repeatedly torn down or defaced by the local constabulary force; (2) whether instructions were forwarded from Dublin Castle to have this done; (3) whether the constabulary were further instructed to send to Dublin Castle the name of any person whom they could identify as having posted the placards; (4) and whether he will arrange that the right of free discussion will be preserved in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: The local police, acting on their own responsibility, took down several of the placards referred to in the vicinity of Carrickmore. The reply to the second and third inquiries is in the negative. I trust that the right of free discussion in Ireland will be preserved.

Thompson Estate, North Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, in North Longford, there are 600 acres of untenanted demesne lands at present let in grazing to surrounding occupiers; whether he is aware that this estate is insolvent and in the hands of the mortgagees, the Scottish Provident Assurance Company; and whether, as untenanted land for the settlement of evicted tenants in county Longford is scarce, he will direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the desirability of acquiring this estate for the benefit of evicted tenants in county Longford.

MR. BRYCE: No application or request in respect of the sale of this estate has been made to the Estates Commissioners, and they have no information on the subject. They inform me, however, that they will communicate with the owners.

Dr. Kenny's Estate, County Galway.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Congested Districts Board have purchased an estate from Dr. Kenny, of Longford, county Galway; if so, at what date, and when may the tenants of small holdings in the neighbourhood expect that it shall be divided amongst them.

Mr. BRYCE: The Congested Districts Board's offer for the purchase of Dr. Comyn Kenny's estate at Longford, county Galway, was accepted on 11th August, 1904, but the property has not yet been vested in the Board. Until that is done the lands cannot be resold to the tenants. The matter is being expedited as much as possible.

Asked by Mr. Field as to the reason for the great delay in re-selling to the tenants, Mr. Bryce replied that the work of the Congested Districts Board was very heavy and that might account for it.

Proposed Monument to Royal Irish Fusiliers at Armagh.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Armagh Urban Council refused permission for a monument to be erected in Armagh to the memory of the Royal Irish Fusiliers who were killed during the late South African war; whether he is also aware that a force of police was drafted into Armagh to protect certain persons in erecting and unveiling a monument to the memory of a man called Carbery, who was killed when fighting with the Boers against British troops; and will he say what was the cost to the ratepayers for the extra police, and what action, if any, does he propose taking in the matter.

Mr. BRYCE: On the 5th instant, the Armagh Urban District Council refused to grant a site opposite to the Court House for the purpose mentioned in the first part of the Question. On the 8th June, 1902, an extra force of 102 police was drafted into Armagh for the preservation of the peace in connection with the unveiling, in a cemetery, of a memorial to the person mentioned in the second part of the Question. The cost of the extra police, which fell on local rates, was £20 12s. 2d. The Local Government Board have no power to interfere with the discretion of the district council as to granting a site.

Gort Outrage.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police have received information of an attack made upon the house of a man named Kearney at Ballinderreen, near Gort, in the Athenry district, on the night of the 19th instant, or of the fact that six shots were fixed into the man's bedroom; and will he say whether Kearney grazes a farm from which the former tenant was evicted, and have the police any clue to the perpetrators of the outrage.

Mr. BRYCE: The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. Mr. Kearney is the occupier of a small grazing farm, but it is not an evicted farm. Three men have been arrested and remanded in connection with the offence.

Attacks on Catholics at Desertmartin, Derry.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Inspector-General, Royal Irish Constabularly, has received an application from the clergyman of Desertmartin, county Derry, asking for additional police to protect the lives and the property of the people of the district; whether he is aware that during the past three months the houses of Catholics have been wrecked, shots fired through windows, and hayricks levelled to the ground, and that two men, named McKenna and McGeehan, are now lying dangerously ill, the result of being waylaid and beaten on the road; and if steps will be taken to protect the lives and property of the people in this district.

Mr. BRYCE: The Inspector-General received the application referred to on the 20th instant, and he is carefully considering what steps may be necessary for the preservation of the peace in this district, either in the way of strengthening the police force at neighbouring stations or forming a temporary post at Desertmartin. It is a fact that some offences such as are mentioned in the Question have recently been committed, and four men are at present awaiting trial for seriously assaulting the men McKenna and McGeehan. I think it better to make no statement on this latter case while proceedings are *sub judice.*

Ballinacurra Sewer Works.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board have sanctioned the works in connection with the Ballinacurra sewer at Limerick; and, if so, will he use his influence with the Board of Works to have the loan advanced with as little delay as possible, so that this work may be carried out.

MR. BRYCE: On the 16th instant, the Local Government Board gave their sanction to the Limerick No. 1 Rural District Council for a loan of £1,500 for the purpose mentioned. It is open to the council to contract for this loan in the open market or to apply to the Board of Works for it. I am informed by the latter Board that they have not received an application for this particular loan, but that in the case of another loan applied for by the same council they have found it necessary to point out that, owing to the repeated failure of the council to fulfil their undertakings on existing loans, the Board of Works will be precluded from making further loans unless they receive reliable assurance of punctuality in future payments.

Irish Legislation.

MR. FINCH (Rutland): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the Bills he proposes to introduce this session.

MR. BRYCE: I am not at present in a position to state what Bills I may be able to introduce this Session.

MR. FINCH: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman tell us what are to be the instalments of the " larger policy " ?

MR. BRYCE: I suppose the hon. Member refers to the instalments connected with land purchase. I can say no more at present.

Irish Land Purchase.

LORD CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if further grants of money will be proposed to facilitate the operation of the Land Purchase Acts.

MR. BRYCE: There is, and will be, a willingness on the part of His Majesty's Government to provide such further sums of money as may be from time to time needed to facilitate the operation of the Land Purchase Act.

Church Discipline Commissioners' Report.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is any probability of the Report of the Royal Commission on Church Discipline being received within the next month, so as to be in the hands of Members prior to the discussion on the Church Discipline Bill.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.; for Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN): I must refer the hon. Gentleman to the answer given by the Prime Minister last week to a similar question.

Royal Commission on Canals.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is in a position to give the House any information regarding the promised Royal Commission on Canals, and particularly whether he can state its constitution and terms of reference.

MR. ASQUITH (for Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN): This business is in a forward state, and the Prime Minister hopes very shortly to make the necessary arrangements for taking His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

Procedure Rules.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he will make a statement as to the proposed alterations in the Procedure Rules.

MR. ASQUITH: My best answer is to say that I propose to-morrow, on behalf of the Prime Minister, to move for a

Select Committee to be appointed to consider the question of procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the Amendment of existing rules and any new rules which may be considered desirable for the efficient despatch of business.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Will the Committee have the power to inquire into the period of the session?

MR. ASQUITH: That is the intention.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

John Michael Fleetwood Fuller, esquire, for the County of Wilts (Western or Westbury Division).

NEW BILLS.

POLICE (SUPERANNUATION) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Superannuation of Constables," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 54.]

NOTICE OF ACCIDENTS BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Returns and Notifications of Accidents in mines, quarries, factories, and workshops, and under The Notice of Accidents Act, 1894," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 55.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) (No. 2) BILL.

"To make further provision for Local Government in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Major Anstruther-Gray; supported by Mr. Younger, Mr. Cochrane, Sir John Tuke, and Mr. Eugene Wason; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 7th March, and to be printed. [Bill 56.]

BOROUGH COURT (DUBLIN) BILL.

"To better define the jurisdiction and improve the procedure of the Borough Court of the city of Dublin; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Clancy; supported by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, and Mr. Waldron; to be read a second time upon Friday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 57.]

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

"To amend the Agricultural Holdings Acts, and to make other provisions as to the Tenure of Agricultural Land," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Mr. Price, Mr. Reckitt, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Mackarness, and Mr. Luttrell; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 58.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT, upon the Motion of Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, took the Chair of the Committee as Chairman of Ways and Means.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905-6.

CLASS II.

1. £130 (Supplementary), Friendly Societies Registry.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) thought the Department ought to give an explanation why there was this increase of £130. It was in his opinion necessary to study economy, and he did not therefore think he need make any apology for drawing attention even to this small increase. He wished to know why it was that the original provision had not proved sufficient.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouth, N.) said the excess was due to the appointment of a second Assistant Registrar, rendered necessary by the great increase in the amount of work. The actual salary was £600 a year, rising by annual instalments of £25 to £700. He thought his hon. friend might rest assured that no extravagant expenditure would be incurred.

Motion put and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

2. £36,000 (Supplementary), Temporary Commissions.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he desired to give the Financial Secretary an opportunity of giving the Committee any information he might have with regard to the work of the War Stores Commission and the prospect of the presentation of a Report. It was appointed by the late Government to investigate into and report as to allegations made by the Committee presided over by Sir William Butler; and it was also entrusted to inquire as to the responsibility of persons concerned in the waste of stores in South Africa. He understood that the Commission had appointed some representative of its number to go to South Africa to take evidence, but up to the present time they had not had anything in the nature of an interim Report. He wished to know whether any such Report had been presented. The right hon. Gentleman had, no doubt, some information to justify the arrest a short time ago of a number of non-commissioned officers, but he should be glad to know what further action the Government proposed to take in the matter. The Commission dealt with a public scandal, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to assure them that the matter was present in the mind of the Government, and that a Report would be soon presented. He had another question to ask. He understood the Motor Car Commission had concluded taking evidence, and he wished to ask whether they could have any information as to whether a Report would be presented. Another very interesting Commission was the Local Government Board Redistribution Commission, appointed by the late Government, without any authority from the House, with a view to obtaining advice as to a Redistribution Bill to be presented. At the time their conduct was very much criticised, and it was generally recognised to be a political expedient and nothing else. He therefore thought they were entitled to ask how the money had been spent and whether the Commission was still in existence.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said the Motor Car Commission had completed its labours and the Report was in course of preparation. The Redistribution Commission had also concluded its labours, but he thought the subject of its investigations was of a confidential nature, and he could not give that fuller information which hon. Members would like.

*MR. MORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us the Members of the Commission, whether they are going to Report, and what they have done with the £1,200?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I do not know their names; I have not seen their Report; I understand the last Government have dissolved them; and I would suggest that there the matter should rest.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said that in his opinion it was infamous to demand that the public should be asked to pay for this device for prolonging the late Administration. In the very last stages of the existence of the late Government they were looking about for some pretext for living a few minutes longer, and one of the devices hit upon was to start the question of redistribution, with special reference to the Irish representation. The whole object was to cut down the representation of Ireland and not to reform the system in either England or Scotland; and was it reasonable that the public should have to pay for the designs of a mere political club organised in the Conservative interest? It was a most extraordinary thing that the President of the Local Government Board should not know anything about the Commission. He could understand documents relating to foreign affairs being kept private, though they were always made known to successive Ministries, but by what right had the late Government withheld the documents of this Commission from the present President of Local Government Board, and how was it that he regarded them as deserving of being treated as confidential? He did not object to the late or any Government keeping private their documents if they did not ask the public to pay for them, but to compel the country to pay for a partisan document seemed to him to be the most impudent thing he had known since he entered the House twenty years ago, and, as far as he was concerned, he had no intention of allowing the documents to remain private, so long as the demand was made that they should be paid for by the public purse. If Mr. Balfour would arrange with the right hon. Gentleman to pay for this out of the funds of the Carlton Club, he would raise no further objection. He might then keep the documents for they would interest him no more, but they would interest him very much if he found the demand that they should be paid for out of the public purse was persisted in.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he thought the House was entitled to some further imformation from the President of the Local Government Board. Why was this called a private document? The appointment of the Commission was announced in the House, and the names of its Members were read out by a Minister, one of them being an officer of the Local Government Board, who gave his public time for the preparation of the Commission's Report. He could not understand the ground on which they were told that the document was a private one, that they had nothing to do with it, and that they were not to see it. There was at least one if not two officers of the Local Government Board on the Commission, and it could not surely be fairly argued that the House was to have no knowledge of the Report.

*Mr. MORTON said that what they ought to know was who had had the money and how much they had each had; and, if the right hon. Gentleman could not that day give them the information, he thought they should postpone the matter. The transaction must be known to somebody in the Local Government Board, and they ought not to pass it over without receiving the fullest information, especially as they were told that it was a mere electioneering dodge. If anyone could prove that it was not, they would have the opportunity, but no one had risen yet on the Opposition Benches. He had no doubt that they were ashamed of the expenditure themselves. They had now a Liberal Government in power, pledged to economy, and he consequently hoped that they would have the fullest information on the matter, otherwise he should feel obliged to vote against the Estimate altogether.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said there was one point which had not been cleared up by the President of the Local Government Board. Had the Commission completed the work for which it was appointed, and had any member of the Government a complete Report as to the work? They wanted to know whether the country had got anything at all for the £1,200 they were now asked to vote. There might be schemes of redistribution hereafter. Would the findings of this Commission be of any further value? Would they be any contribution to any such scheme?

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said it seemed to him that they would be creating a rather dangerous precedent, if they voted money spent by somebody, they did not know who, and spent in some way, they did not know how. He considered the only way was to move that the Vote should be reduced by £1,200.

Mr. DALZIEL said he understood the matter did not come in the cognizance of the right hon. Gentleman, and that he was not in any way responsible for it. He did not think they could blame the Government at all, but this was the only opportunity they had of protesting against public money being spent in this fashion. The Commission originated in the failure of the late Government to pass certain Resolutions brought before Parliament, and it was appointed to give an indication to the public that they really meant business with regard to redistribution. It was evident that the late Government meant nothing by it; it was a Party expedient, and it was the duty of the Committee to protest against it. It was true that Mr. Gerald Balfour was nominally responsible for the matter, but he could not help expressing his surprise that no Member of the Front Opposition Bench had thought it his duty to say a single word on behalf of the late Government. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer must have some explanation as to how it came about that the expenditure was authorised. He would like to know the reasons which induced him to give his authority. Did he really believe the Commission was appointed in the public interest? The appointment of the Commission was an attempt to get round the House of Commons, and the matter was of importance from the point of view of precedent. How far was the Government going to be justified in spending public money without the authority of the House? This Commission was appointed to deal with a matter which was never accepted by the House. All that the House knew about it was that the late Prime Minister brought forward a series of resolutions before he had taken the trouble to study the procedure. The Commission was therefore an investigating Commission, just as if they had appointed a Commission of the Carlton Club; it was a mere fishing Commission appointed to gather sufficient information to justify the then Government in bringing in a Bill the next year. If they did not protest, where was the matter to stop? Would the Government be justified in appointing twenty Committees and in spending thousands of pounds without the authority of the House? He could imagine the protest that would come from the opposite side of the House if twenty Committees were appointed in connection with the Bills promised by the present Government. He thought the Members of the late Government, if they were not disposed to defend their own action in the matter, might give them the advantage of the information they had obtained. They were told that the papers were private, but why were they private? Perhaps the facts were against their own case, and that it was owing to that that the Report was to be kept secret. He would, however, appeal to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer as to whether he had not some information to give them with regard to the matter.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead) asked if it was not time that such questions as those relating to the redistribution of seats should be referred, not to a partisan Committee, but to some judicial Committee, representing all interests. There was a principle involved in the matter, and if they considered the question impartially and brought out a Report not partisan at all they would be taking a step forward. Then there was the question of spending money without the approval of the House. In extreme cases they might be inclined to excuse that sort of thing, but he did not see that this was an extreme case. He could understand also that if they were dealing with some great international question secrecy might be of vital importance in the public interest, but this was entirely a civil or domestic matter, and they ought to be placed in full possession of all the information.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he had a great deal of sympathy with the principles enunciated by the hon. Member who had just sat down, though he differed from him in the belief he had that they applied to the facts of the present case. The Commission could not be described as a partisan Commission, for it was composed, he believed, entirely of officials.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: There were two officials.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that at any rate two members of the Commission were excluded by their public service from being active partisans.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): The third gentleman is known to be an authority on local government.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, continuing, said that it would also be found, when the name of the third gentleman was mentioned, that his appointment was not of a partisan character. Therefore, although he agreed that it would be not merely wrong, but something of a scandal if they appointed a partisan Commission when they sought information on which to found legislation, he absolutely denied, and he was sure he would be supported by Gentlemen opposite who knew the facts, that the Commission appointed was partisan. If the hon. Gentleman opposite objected to the appointment of Departmental Committees, he must use his influence with the present Government to alter their ways, for, although they had been in office only a few months, they had announced an unusual number of Commissions and Committees, the expense of which the House would be asked to authorise.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: We shall get the Reports.

*MR. MORTON: It does not follow that the money will be spent first.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that as far as the Government could tell, the House was committed to the expenditure before it was asked for its sanction. He did not complain, but the hon. Gentleman opposite below the gangway, if he wished the principles he had named to be followed, must exert very active influence on the Government. The first principle the hon. Gentleman had laid down was, he understood, that when a Commission had concluded its work, the information should be made available for the House, unless the public interest necessitated its being withheld. It was a fact that every Government and every Department had from time to time to appoint Departmental Committees, and in some cases their Reports were necessarily of a highly confidential character, and could not be published without injury to the public interest, and without, in fact, making it impossible to conduct similar inquiries successfully in future; but the Commission they were considering was not a Commission of that kind. It was a mistake to say that the House of Commons refused to pass the Resolutions submitted by the late Government. The Speaker ruled that it would be necessary to break them up into such a great number of propositions that it was impossible to proceed with the matter in the then state of business, and the Government accordingly appointed the Commission, not for a partisan purpose, but for the sake of gaining information which it was necessary to have if the seats in the House were to be redistributed more in accordance with the claims of population in the country. They appointed the Commission to ascertain the facts upon which they could subsequently ask the House to act, and if they had retained office they would of course have asked the House to act upon the Report, and would have supplied the information upon which their Bill was framed to the House. The responsibility had now passed from them, and it was no longer for them to say whether the information should be forthcoming or not. He had felt it his duty to explain that they had acted not only in consonance with an unbroken line of precedents, but in accordance with the common dictates of common sense.

MR. LEIF JONES: Can the right hon Gentleman say whether the Commission completed its work or whether its work was broken off in the middle?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is a question which ought to be addressed to the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he thought the right hon. Gentleman had entirely misunderstood the force of what had been said on the Ministerial side of the House. They did not say that this was a partisan Commission so far as the individual members of it were concerned, but that it was appointed for partisan purposes, that it was in fact done to save the faces of the Ministers then in office. They did not dare face the House of Commons with their Resolutions, and they therefore held a meeting at the Carlton Club and decided to withdraw them. Then behind the scenes they appointed a Commission. What he wanted to ask the President of the Local Government Board was whether he would suggest that the £1,200 ought to be levied on the right hon. Gentlemen opposite instead of asking the House to vote the money.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) asked if there was not a precedent against the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Surely he was right in saying that on a previous occasion a Commission or Committee was appointed to inquire into redistribution proposals by a Liberal Government and that, although they went out of office before the labours of that Committee were completed, they left those labours, in view of the fact that they were performed in the public interest, to their successors. If that was so, it was a very strong precedent. He urged that when public servants were appointed to do public work their Report should be brought before the House, except when it was against the public interest that that course should be taken.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) thought that Irish Members should protest against this waste of public money. It was not necessary to raise the charge that this was a partisan Committee, but he said that the action of the late Government was of a partisan character. There was no question of urgency and no demand from Parliament, or any considerable section of Members, for the step. The whole thing was sprung upon the House at the fag end of a session without notice. It was part of the selfish and woeful mismanagement of the House that a Resolution on this subject should be brought forward which resolved itself into twelve or thirteen motions. He supposed that the money having been spent, all they could do was to register their protest, but if there were any practical means of securing it he would say that the members of the late Government who appointed this Commission without the assent of this House should be called upon to pay the money. This was a warning that Ministers should look before they leaped. The whole scheme was hastily and ill-considered and upon a partisan basis. It reflected no credit upon His Majesty's late Government.

*MR. MORTON said the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had not told them what they wanted to know, and that was, who got the money.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no access at the present time to the official records. Perhaps those who have access to those records can answer the Question.

*MR. MORTON said the money was paid by the late Government, and surely they had got receipts for it. He thought this was an illustration of the careless way in which the affairs of the country had been administered by the late Government, under whom the expenses had increased by £50,000,000 per annum. What they wanted to know from the President of the Local Government Board, or some other official, was who had this money. These permanent officials were enjoying a handsome salary, but they appeared in addition to have got this money. The Committee were entitled to know how every penny of the public money had been spent.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) considered that there was a much more important question to consider than where the money had gone to, and that was where the Report was to be found. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he knew nothing about its contents, but if it was not in the office of the Local Government Board, where was it? Had it been taken away by some of the late Ministers and was it now to be found in one of their houses or in one of the clubs they frequented; or was it in the possession of the hon. Gentleman who ought to have it, the hon. Member for Waterford?

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said it was perfectly obvious that from time to time Governments must change, and that there were a good many matters of legislation which required to be looked into and upon which the different Departments of the Executive were bound to collect evidence and make inquiries. He desired to point out to the House how exceedingly inconvenient it would be if, whenever a change of Government happened, it were possible for the new Government to propose to leave hon. Members who had been acting upon a Committee of this kind in the position that their expenses would not be paid. This was a storm in a tea cup, and an attempt to cast discredit upon the late Government for matters in which they were acting strictly within their rights. The desire seemed to be to call into question expenses incurred in a perfectly regular manner. Hon. Members had asked where was the Report, but it was conceivable that there was no Report, and their demands, therefore, were perfectly futile. It was perfectly obvious that there was no use in cross-examining the President of the Local Government Board as to where the Report was, becaus he said he knew nothing about it. The discussion, therefore, seemed to him to be altogether absurd.

MR. JOHN BURNS explained that whatever money was disbursed in connection with the investigations of this

Committee, hon. Members could rely upon it that it had been properly paid by the Local Government Board. It would be a mistake to imply that anybody had anything to do with the expenditure in the way suggested. This Committee was appointed by the last Government, and the present Government was in no sense responsible for it. The Committee was appointed, presumably in the public interest, for a definite public object, to deal with the question of whether or not there should be a redistribution scheme. Of its scope he knew nothing, and that also applied to its object, although they might have their suspicions. As to its conclusions, he was a child in these things, and he knew nothing about them, and he could not tell whether the Report was at the Local Government Board or not. He had been otherwise and better engaged than in searching through the archives of his office to find out what the late Government had done in regard to redistribution, and he had not seen the Report. He believed the Committee sat and did some work, and reported in some way, though he knew not what way. The expenses they incurred were the amount included in the supplementary Estimate now submitted. If hon. Gentlemen thought that by postponing this question they would be able further to elucidate the questions which had been addressed to him, he should be pleased to comply with their request, but so far as he was concerned, and until he was released from what seemed to be his duty as President of the Local Government Board that afternoon, he construed that the document was confidential, and it seemed to him that it would be unjust to his predecessors, unless the Department was released from the confidence attaching to the document, to publish it. To publish it would be unfair and unbecoming, but in the event of the late Prime Minister's being returned that day for the City of London, and questions being put to him on the subject—he could not conceive that the right hon. Gentleman could have anything to hide in the matter—if the right hon. Gentleman was willing to assent to the publication of the document "Barkis is willing," and he was ready to assent to its production. He had nothing to add to what he had said to the effect that this document must be regarded as confidential, and pending further inquiries, he might ask to be allowed to adhere to the terms of the answer he made yesterday.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) thought that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had made a very fair proposal, namely, that until the late Prime Minister returned to the House he should not be released from what he considered his obligation of honour towards his predecessors. He was sure that everyone would respect and sympathise with the feelings which led the right hon. Gentleman to adopt that view, although with great respect he took a somewhat different view from him in regard to this matter. He knew nothing more than the right hon. Gentleman about the Report. He did not know what it contained, nor did he know if the Report was a concluded one. The suggestion, however, that the Report was to be of a partisan character was one, however, which must be repudiated at once. It was a Report asked for by the Department, not in a partisan sense, but in order to obtain information which was necessary, if redistribution proceedings were to be continued, and the suggestion that it was partisan in any way must fall upon the gentlemen composing the Committee. He could say of the Local Government Board that there was no Department in the country to which one could go with such confidence to get not an *ex parte*, but an independent statement. Therefore he was convinced that there could be no reason whatever why, if there was a Report, it should not be made public. He gathered that the President of the Local Government Board had been occupied in very important duties and had not had time to ascertain whether this Report was in the Department or not. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should make inquiries in the Department. He would find whether the Report was there, and it was in his own discretion and that of nobody else to decide whether that Report was to be made public. There were many Reports prepared in our public Departments which, in the public interest, could not be published, but he did not know whether that consideration applied to this case or not. He was quite sure that Mr. Balfour was not desirous of any secrecy whatever in the matter.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said the valuable suggestion had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board that the Committee should postpone the further inquiry into this Estimate. He hoped it was not proposed to postpone it for an indefinite period. It might well be postponed until the President of the Local Government Board had found out whether the document was supposititious or whether, if it was in existence, the right hon. Gentleman could see if it was to the advantage of those by whom the Commission was appointed or those who sat upon the Ministerial side of the House. The question for the Committee was what was the object for which this £1,200 was paid. It was a mere flea-bite to the last Government, but in the present Government they were all financial reformers, and they desired to check all these extravagances; and unless they commenced with these little items of £1,200 here and £3,000 there, presented on this Estimate, they would never accomplish that financial retrenchment to which they were all pledged. Another point was that there were two gentlemen put on this Committee who were public servants, and were earning salaries in other directions. If some one on the Treasury Bench who was responsible for the conduct of the Government would look into all the payments the Committee were now asked to consider, they would see that all the people put into these Commissions were public servants. It had become almost a scandal that public servants should be withdrawn from the ordinary business of their departments and put on Committees or Commissions and made the arbiters upon questions which were closely connected with the duties which they themselves were called upon day by day to discharge. It appeared to him that the whole of the expenditure of the State was controlled by persons whose business was not to decrease the expenditure but to take charge of the services of the State themselves.

*SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth) said he did not believe for one moment that any hon. Member of the Committee would suggest that he had received any of this money, in spite of what his hon. friend had said, and so far as the Report was concerned he would very much like to see it himself if it existed. The late Government originally intended to proceed by way of Bill for redistribution, but they ultimately decided to proceed by Resolution. That Resolution was brought forward in the form of an *en bloc* Resolution, but it was found that it could not be put *en bloc* and it was abandoned, because there was no time to discuss it. In justice to an absent Member it was due to Mr. Gerald Balfour that he should recall to the memory of the Committee the fact that that right hon. Gentleman stated several times that the course the late Government proposed to take was to appoint a Committee of three, of whom two were members of the Local Government Board staff and the third an eminent King's Counsel. Mr. Gerald Balfour stated distinctly that the result of the inquiries of those gentlemen would be confidential to the Government, and that on the information the then Government would be able to modify or mature the Resolution before the House into a Bill, and that then they intended to appoint Boundary Commissioners whose Report would be public property and would be brought before the House. In his recollection the propriety of the Government's course was not contested, and it was only fair that the course pursued by the Government of the day should be at the public expense

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that what the Committee were now asked to do was to pay £1,200 for a Report which no one knew anything about, or whether it was in existence. In his opinion the only way to deal with this item was to postpone further inquiry till the Report stage, and if it were then found that there was no such document in existence, he for one would refuse to pass it. The point put forward, that this document was confidential, was not sound.

It would have been if this had been a departmental Committee, but inasmuch as this was not a departmental Committee it could not be said that its Report was confidential.

MR. JOHN BURNS said the suggestion made by the hon. Member was a reasonable one. There was an obvious desire in some quarters of the House to know more of this Report if it existed, and a desire upon the part of those who sat on the front Opposition bench for further investigation, and therefore, if the hon. Member would withdraw his Motion to reduce the Vote, he would agree to postpone its consideration.

MR. DALZIEL said that as he had not yet moved his reduction he had nothing to withdraw. When the Vote came up for Report he hoped and believed they would have an opportunity given for its discussion. He had asked another question which he thought the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would be able to answer with regard to the War Stores Commission.

MR. McKENNA said that Mr. Justice Farwell had unfortunately been ill, and, in consequence, certain delay had taken place in issuing the Report. He was expecting that the Commission would finally report about the end of March, but it might be delayed a little beyond that time. Their investigation in South Africa had been undertaken by a barrister, Mr. Reeve, who had, he believed, executed his work with extreme skill and energy, and certain arrests had been made in consequence. There had been, however, no official communication yet received upon this or as to whether the trials of the persons charged had taken place.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he had gathered that a large number of people had been prosecuted, and he would like to know whether in each case the individual who was responsible for giving or conveying bribes was also going to be prosecuted, because it seemed to him that that person was very much more guilty than the poor non-commissioned officer who might have received a bribe.

MR. McKENNA said he could only repeat that no Report had yet been isssued by the Commission.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said the hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that various arrests had been made.

MR. McKENNA: No; I understand so.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: Then he cannot say whether they have been in this country?

MR. McKENNA: They have not been in this country.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON said he understood certain officers were placed under arrest in this country. Could the Financial Secretary of the Treasury find out who they were and whether arrests were still being made, and, if so, whether any decision had been arrived at?

MR. McKENNA said he had been informed that there had been certain soldiers suspended, but he did not understand that any soldier had been placed under arrest.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman give fuller information on the Report stage?

MR. McKENNA said he could not promise that, because the Commission was a statutory one, and there was no authority for asking them for information on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD called attention to the item of £100 for travelling expenses for the London Locomotion Commission. Were they expected to believe that the expenses were exactly that sum? It was time that with regard to a number of those items the House should have some information as to the basis on which they were framed.

MR. McKENNA thought the hon. Member would agree that it would be very undesirable to introduce a supplementary Estimate, say for £60 or £70, which might not be certain to cover the amount, which was, however, not very large. It referred to a considerable number of people, and although each item might be small the total was roughly put at £100. Of course, if the money were not spent it would be surrendered at the end of the year and would go to the reduction of the National Debt.

*MR. MORTON said, regarding the total cost of the London Locomotion Commission, that the £1,700 was, of course, in addition to the large sum of money previously voted. What had been the total expenses of the Commission ? Who comprised the Advisory Committee, the fees and expenses of which on the supplementary Estimate amounted to £850. These Commissions of Inquiry, especially Royal Commissions, were very expensive, and it would be advisable, if they were to economise public money, that more details should be furnished as to how the money was expended.

MR. MCKENNA said the Advisory Committee was appointed early in 1904. A provision was made in the Estimates of last year of £10,000 for the expenses of the Board, but the whole of that was not expended. This £850 was a re-vote of the sum not expended last year which was carried to the Sinking Fund. As regarded the total cost of the Commission he would give the figures later on.

*MR. MORTON asked what was the Feeble-Minded Commission referred to in the Estimate. How had the sum of £3,450 against it been expended.

MR. MCKENNA said that the expenses covered the investigations of doctors receiving £3 3s. a day for a day's work of eight hours.

*MR. MORTON said he observed an item of £1,200 for the Poor Law Commission, but there was not the slightest explanation of what it was for. The supplementary Estimate also showed that the total original Estimate for temporary Commissions was £32,804, and a further sum was now required of £36,000. It was an example of how the money of the country was spent, and how to a very large extent it was wasted.

MR. MCKENNA hoped his hon. friend would understand that these Estimates were prepared by the late Government and the information for which he asked was to a certain extent not in the hands of the present Government. The policy of the appointment of these Commissions would be better explained by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Poor Law Commission was appointed last year, and the Chairman was Lord George Hamilton.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked if any fresh appointments had been made to the Feeble-Minded Commission since the present Government came into office.

MR. JOHN BURNS said a number of requests had been communicated to the Government to enlarge the scope and personnel of the Commission, and these requisitions had been considered by the Government. The additional names had not yet been decided upon.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Has any fresh appointment on the Commission been made since the present Government came into office ?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Not definitely.

Vote agreed to.

3. £10,000 Vote, Milan Exhibition, 1906.

MR. DALZIEL said that there was an extraordinary note at the bottom of this Estimate which stated that—

> "The expenditure out of this Grant-in-Aid will not be accounted for in detail to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. Any balance of the sum issued which may remain unexpended on the 31st March, 1906, will not be liable to surrender on that date."

That was rather an unusual note. This Grant-in-Aid was given and they were not to have access to information as to the way in which it was to be spent. He hoped the present Government were not responsible for this Estimate. He did not think that a proviso of this sort ought to be inserted in any Estimate, and it was a perfect farce to ask them to take an interest in the Estimates if they prevented the officials of this House from taking the necessary precaution to see the money was not wasted. He hoped they would have a satisfactory explanation.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that applications of this kind were constantly made to the Treasury, and very constantly they had to be refused. The number of exhibitions during the last ten years had been large, and the amount of money expended was serious. He wished to suggest to the Secretary to the Treasury that the sporadic and irregular manner in which grants were made to these international exhibitions ought to be made a subject of inquiry by this Parliament. He noticed that the Treasury were responsible for the granting of this £10,000, but he could not help thinking that the Treasury was the wrong Department to deal with these grants. Such matters ought to be accounted for to the Treasury by the President of the Board of Trade or the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who was most in touch with the Consular service. The Treasury was essentially the wrong Department to deal with expenditure of this character. Matters relating to international exhibitions ought to be arranged almost entirely by the Board of Trade. When an application of this character was made to the British Government, it generally came from an irresponsible body of merchants in the particular country where the exhibition was being arranged. A Commission was appointed which contained a great number of ornamental names of persons who never attended, and they had no records before them and no continuity of policy. Sometimes it was the Chamber of Commerce, and in another case it was the Royal Engineers, and so on, and he thought the Government would do well to consider if some small permanent body could be set up to whom all such applications might promptly be referred. They would then have a body to whom all these applications could be made, and from whom applicants could receive skilled and professional advice. These applications often come late in the day, and then there was a scramble for sites, with the result that the commercial and industrial activity of this country was seldom shown to advantage. He would no doubt be told that he was asking the Government to set up a new department which would cost money, but if the Secretary to the Treasury would investigate this question he would find that the unbusinesslike way in which the Commissions had been managed was such that the waste of expenditure would run into scores and scores of thousands of pounds. If they had a small permanent body, he could name three or four competent people who would undertake to do the directing work gratis, and for the sum of £150 or £200 a year, they could allocate specially some skilful clerk from the Board of Trade for this purpose, who would record all the information, keep the accounts, be in touch with all these matters, and who would be able to advise the Treasury whenever these applications were made. In nine cases out of ten the applications ought to be promptly refused. He did not ask the hon. Member for an answer at the present moment, but he trusted that he would undertake to look into this matter in a sympathetic manner, because he was convinced that it was the best measure they could adopt to prevent extravagance in this matter of international exhibitions.

Mr. PAUL (Northampton) asked why this money should not be accounted for to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. He should like to know what right the Government or the Treasury had to withhold any information from the Auditor-General, who was a public officer, quite independent of the Treasury and responsible only to this House.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) thought they ought not to spend the taxpayers money upon exhibitions in countries which kept our goods out by prohibitive tariffs.

Mr. McKENNA said he entirely agreed with the general observations of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs and the hon. Member for Northampton with regard to the advisability of all public accounts being submitted to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. But the circumstances in this case were very exceptional. The grant of £10,000 had been made, and he did not take any responsibility for the expenditure of the money and the grant was a final one. As a rule a certain method was adopted. They usually retained control, and if the amount granted was not found sufficient there was generally a fresh demand made upon the Treasury to increase the amount. That course had been adopted in the case of other exhibitions. In the present case they had decided once for all that the grant should be £10,000 and no more, and the grant having been made it was entrusted to the Commissioners to expend the money. As a matter of fact they had stipulated that an audit should be made and shown to the Treasury, but they did not ask that the accounts should be audited by a department of the Government. The noble Lord made some ingenious suggestions as to a department being set up for the special consideration of applications for grants for foreign exhibitions. He would remind him that at the present moment foreign exhibitions were in the Department of the Foreign Office, and Colonial Exhibitions in the Department of the Colonial Office. Neither, he thought, were in the Department of the Treasury. They were accounted for by the Treasury, but the applications were not primarily settled or decided by the Treasury. The expenditure was controlled by the Treasury. He did not quite gather from the noble Lord whether he proposed that the department which he would set up should be independent of the Treasury with regard to control of expenditure, because if he made any such proposal as that, he could not even pretend that it would be considered with sympathy. There could be only one department of the State to control expenditure. If they were to sub-divide control it would be impossible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to make up his Budget for the year.

LORD BALCARRES: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

MR. McKENNA said that in regard to the suggestion to appoint a special officer of the Board of Trade to take control of the management of exhibitions, he would submit the matter to his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade who, he had no doubt, would give it his most sympathetic consideration. A grant to the exhibition of Marseilles was refused on the ordinary lines regulating the Treasury procedure in granting these sums. In the present case Milan was made an exception to the ordinary rule. As a general rule a grant was sanctioned only in a case where a foreign exhibition was conducted by the Government of the country where it was held and where it was held in the capital of the country. The Milan Exhibition was not primarily undertaken by the Italian Government and it was not to be held in the capital of Italy. Special representations were made to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer who, for reasons which the right hon. Gentleman thought were sufficient, and which he himself had no doubt were sufficient, agreed to this special grant's being made. He thought the House would be perfectly agreed that the sum in question was not excessive. In the case of Marseilles no special reason was shown why the Government should depart from the usual rule, and accordingly the request was refused.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Financial Secretary of the Treasury had perfectly correctly stated the rules upon which the Treasury had been accustomed to act in this matter, not only during the short time he himself presided over that office, but also under his predecessors. He thought the hon. Gentleman would find, as he and his predecessors had found, that there was considerable difficulty in dealing with the applications received for grants to exhibitions. The Treasury had tried to limit the number of applications it would receive and to maintain the rule under which grants were made. The rule was that the exhibition was to be national and held in the capital of the country where it took place. But it had been recognised that to the rule there must occasionally be exceptions, and exceptions had sometimes been made for political and other reasons. By political reasons he meant where it was thought desirable in the national interest that there should be the interchange of courtesy which representation at such an exhibition involved. This led to special grants being made for the exhibitions at St. Louis and Chicago.

The exhibition at Milan was a national exhibition, the first national industrial exhibition held in the Kingdom of Italy. Although it did not fulfil the other Treasury condition of being held in the capital, it was pointed out with unanswerable force by parties interested that Rome was not the natural place for an industrial exhibition, that Milan was the industrial capital, and that for an exhibition of this kind must be considered the capital of Italy. Therefore, though in the first instance he refused to make any grant to this exhibition, because it did not literally fulfil the regulations they had endeavoured to maintain, he, on the further representations which were made to him, and on receiving assurances both from the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade of their interest in the matter and of their desire that the British Government should be officially represented, and especially on being advised by the Board of Trade that this was a matter that concerned the trade of the country, he undertook to allow a grant and not to present a Supplementary Estimate this year, as the hon. Gentleman had done, but to propose to the House of Commons in the regular course of the Estimates in the next Parliamentary year a grant similar to that which had now been laid before the Committee. He took no exception to the very natural course which the hon. Gentleman had pursued. He supposed that the hon. Gentleman desired as far as possible to wind up all the liabilities of the late Government in these Supplementary Estimates, and he did not for a moment criticise that decision. He need not say that if the Vote were challenged he would give it all the support in his power, for it embodied a proposal he had intended to make to the House. As to the procedure which had been commented on, he thought the hon. Gentleman opposite had fairly explained the reasons which had led him to adopt it. It was customary to treat a grant-in-aid in this way. A grant-in-aid was not an Estimate in the ordinary sense. It was a definite contribution made once and for all, and with that contribution the liability of the Government ceased.

Mr. DALZIEL: Is the money limited to expenditure on the British part of the exhibition?

Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said it was limited to representing British trade in a particular Exhibition—in this case Milan Exhibition. If the whole of the money was not required for the purpose for which it was voted, the balance would be surrendered to the Exchequer. What was more likely to happen was that not only would the £10,000 be spent in securing a fitting representation of British trade, but that a considerable sum would be raised by Chambers of Commerce, or from private sources, for the same purpose. In regard to the general question as to whether the Treasury was or was not the best Department to deal with these applications, he entirely concurred with the hon. Gentleman opposite that the financial control of the Treasury must remain complete. It must be for the Treasury to say whether they would give a grant in any particular case or not. The suggestion of his noble friend was not to traverse that control, but there was something in the suggestion that when applications of this kind were made—and they were not infrequently received—it might be of service to the Treasury to have a small permanent Committee who would examine the claims put forward in support of each exhibition and digest the cases for the Treasury. Probably the Committee would themselves be able to decline to submit a considerable number of the applications to the Treasury. He thought that generally the Treasury would not go behind their Committee, but the responsibility and control of the Treasury to grant or refuse applications would still remain complete. He viewed this expenditure for representing British trade in foreign exhibitions with very considerable suspicion. He shared the view of his hon. friend, who expressed doubt as to whether the money was well expended in securing the representation of British trade where heavy tariffs were constantly limiting the trade which that expenditure was intended to promote. He was inclined to think that the money spent for this purpose was of little use except in cases where the exhibitions were of a character, or situated in places to attract visitors on a large scale from what were known as neutral markets—South American markets for instance. He did not pretend to dogmatise on this matter, but it was a conclusion which he had been tempted to arrive at through communications he had had at different times—long before he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, as well as when he held that office—from gentlemen engaged in British industry and commerce. He thought, for instance, that our participation in an exhibition in Paris probably did not lead to any great extension of our trade in France—certainly not to any permanent extension. If it led to a momentary extension, local manufacturers very soon found out what was going on, and they undertook to supply their own market. But an exhibition in Paris was visited by possible customers from other countries where we did not suffer from the same restrictions. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider the suggestion made by the noble Lord in no unfriendly spirit, and with no idea of depriving the Treasury of any of the control it possessed now, and which it must always possess over the national expenditure.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had dealt with the matter of this grant in a fair way. The suggestion of the noble Lord was very absurd, and he was surprised that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer should have given it his support. The Treasury must take the responsibility of dealing with applications, and if they wished to get advice they could get it from the experts of the Departments. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished that advice he could get it without putting the responsibility on any such sub-committee. He thought that the control ought to be complete; but his hon. friend behind him misunderstood the present situation. If a grant were given by municipalities, as was sometimes the case, to an exhibition of this kind, it was donated on a certain ground; he did not think the municipality could ask for the details as to how that sum was expended, but they must be satisfied that any amount not expended for the purpose for which the original sum was voted would be returned. He must say, however, that the foot-note was misleading.

*MR. MORTON thought that these accounts should go before the Auditor-General, because, unless they did, how could it be known that the money was properly expended? He was sure that the understanding of the House was that the details of the expenditure of every sum voted, except the Secret Service Fund, should go before the Auditor-General, who was an independent official, and whose salary could not be discussed by the House, and that he should be allowed to see them. Even in regard to the Secret Service money there were certain officials who certified that it had been expended in a certain manner. It would not do to say that a lump sum was given to a Commissioner who was told "You can do what you like with it."

MR. PAUL said he had followed the very clear statement of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury on matters of policy, but even after the exposition of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh there was a constitutional point which he wished to put. If the Auditor-General wished to see the details of the expenditure under these grants-in-aid, what right had the Treasury to withhold them or any part of them?

MR. DALZIEL thought there had been very little defence of this Vote before the Committee. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that he had viewed the Vote with suspicion, and he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman, holding these views, had consented to it. At the same time, this country ought to be represented in all great exhibitions abroad, because they undoubtedly led to an extension of trade. What was the use of the Treasury making a rule which they were going to break on an occasion? The late Chancellor of the Exchequer broke it because certain strong representations had been made to him in regard to it; but up to the present time he did not see how an exception had been made in regard to the Milan Exhibition. He did not adopt in any respect whatever the suggestion put forward by the Treasury that it was their duty to give a grant-in-aid and then to have nothing more to do with it. Surely the Treasury was strong enough to say "We give a certain amount for a certain purpose; we will not give any more," and to adhere to that condition. If any money was given at all, the Public Accounts Committee should be able to demand of right to know how the money was spent. If that were not done a premium would be given to bad expenditure and a waste of public money.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway) asked to whom this grant-in-aid of £10,000 was to be paid? Who was to take charge of the money, and how was it to be spent? Was it to be expended on an exhibition of British industry in Milan, or was it going to cover the expenses of the Commission going to Milan? Was this a Commission belonging to the British Government, to represent British trade interests at that exhibition? Another question he had to ask was, whether among these exhibits there were any from Ireland? For Ireland would have to pay its share of the cost of the Commission. He wanted to know in what way Ireland would benefit by all this expenditure?

Mr. McKENNA thought that the hon. Member's Questions were reasonable. The fund was granted to a commission or committee, the members of which were nominated by the London and other Chambers of Commerce, the Chairman of which was Lord Brassey, and the hon. treasurer Mr. Felix Schuster. His hon. friend was a little mistaken in regard to the auditing of the accounts. It was quite true that the Auditor-General did not audit them in detail, but he would see that the £10,000 was given to the Commission in a lump sum, not to do with it exactly as they pleased, but for the purposes for which the Commission was appointed. The practice was that the details of expenditure were audited by an auditor appointed by the Commission itself, and that audit ought certainly to be sent to the Treasury.

*Mr. MORTON said that therefore the audit provided by Parliament itself was no audit at all.

Mr. McKENNA: I do not agree to that.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) asked whether it would not be a salutary rule if a public audit went with all Votes of public money in such cases?

Mr. McKENNA said that his hon. friend behind him had stated the usual practice of the House. In this case the Comptroller and Auditor-General, although he would audit the payment of the £10,000 as a whole, would not audit the details of the payment, but the Treasury would accept the audit of the Commission itself, and if the whole of the £10,000 had not been spent, they would expect repayment. Where public money was going to be spent abroad, it did not seem to him undesirable that they should make the grant in a lump sum, and get rid of all responsibility, by keeping the audit to the persons to whom it was paid. Chambers of Commerce would be able to make representations to the Committee.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick) inquired if Irish Chambers of Commerce could make representations.

Mr. McKENNA said there was no limit upon the Chambers of Commerce who could make representations to the Committee. If Chambers of Commerce wished to make representations they would be communicated to the Committee.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan), speaking with the most earnest desire for the industrial interests of England, Ireland, and Scotland, doubted the wisdom of facilitating the exhibition of the products of this country in foreign lands which were trying to exclude our imports by tariffs. We sometimes exhibited the results of long and painful trials and costly experiments, and so educated producers who would give us no chance whatever of effecting sales in their markets. This was not good business.

*Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said he was very reluctant to intervene, and he did not know whether his hon. friend had moved a reduction of the

Vote or not. If it had not been moved he hoped it would be, because a more unsatisfactory mode of audit could not be conceived than that which appeared to have been adopted in this case. They were told that the Commission would in due course audit the expenditure, but he did not understand that the gentlemen who would have the expenditure of this £10,000 would be under any obligations to furnish any vouchers to the Commission. It was most dangerous that a large or even a small sum of money should be paid for public purposes and to deprive the public of the protection of public audit.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he did not quite understand the explanation. The hon. Gentleman, as he understood, said that if there was any sum over it would be surrendered. Did that mean that that amount would run over to another year, and if there was any money left it would be surrendered?

MR. McKENNA said his hon. friend was correct in his supposition.

Vote agreed.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

4. £9,000 (Supplementary), Customs.

CLASS III.

5. £1,600 (Supplementary) Irish Land Commission.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had put down a Motion to reduce this Vote by £100, not with the object of reducing the Vote, he need hardly say, but with the object of endeavouring to obtain some information as to the regulations issued by the Chief Secretary. On looking into the Vote he had some doubt whether it would be in order to call attention to the regulations, and he should be glad to have the Chairman's ruling.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussions of the regulations issued or to be issued by the Chief Secretary would not be in order on this Vote, which is merely for interest and sinking fund on the landlord's bonus.

MR. WALTER LONG: Perhaps I may be allowed to put a question to the representative of the Irish Office as to whether these regulations will be laid upon the Table.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said the Chief Secretary would be in his place in a moment to answer the question.

MR. CLANCY said perhaps the Chairman would consider the advisability of straining the rules in order to allow the right hon. Gentleman to make a statement upon the subject of the regulations—his own regulations; they formed such an interesting subject that he did not think it would be too much to ask the Committee to relax its rules in order to allow them to be discussed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must adhere to my ruling upon that.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL thought there ought to be some explanation of this question. Last year it would be remembered that the House in Committee of Supply cut off £100 from the Irish Land Commission Vote. The Government of the day were defeated. He should like to know how the Land Commission had managed to get on without that £100. If it could do without £100 perhaps also it might be able to do without £1,000, and perhaps the expenditure of the Land Commission might be reduced. The Attorney General or the Solicitor General might explain what this money was needed for. He had been asked by several Irish Members what this Supplementary Vote meant, and he himself would like to know how the Land Commission managed to get on without the £100.

MR. McKENNA: The explanation of this particular sum of £1,600 is a little bit complicated. It is purely financial, and it has nothing to do with the policy of the Irish Government. The Committee will remember that under the Act of 1903 a bonus was given amounting to 12 per cent. upon the purchase-money to the landlords, and the money needed for the payment of this bonus was obtained by the issue of Irish land stock. An Estimate is made at the beginning of the year by the National Debt Commissioners of the amount of money which will be required for the purpose of the bonus. As the market dislikes having issues of Irish land stock made frequently in the course of the year, the practice is to issue the amount once and for all at the beginning of the year. As a result of that the National Debt Commissioners hold at the beginning of the year an amount of money in their hands which they do not immediately need, but which they expect will be required in the course of the year for the payment of the bonus. The Committee will remember that the interest and payment of the sinking fund on the bonus money is borne upon the Votes, and it is in respect of certain portions of this interest and sinking fund that the Supplementary Estimate is now asked for. The National Debt Commissioners hold the money for the issue of the stock in their hands from the beginning of the year, and they endeavour to lend that money until it is required, in order that they may get the interest thereon in reduction of the amount of the Vote. Last year they were perfectly successful in their operation, and no Supplementary Estimate was required; but this year when the National Debt Commissioners proposed to lend the money they found the Japanese had applied for and taken off the market all the Treasury Bills the Government offered. They found also that another medium of loan by them—loans in respect of advances on credit of Ways and Means—was closed to them as, owing to the Finance Act of last year and the issue of Exchequer bonds, the Government was under no necessity to borrow money for the purpose of Supply. Consequently the National Debt Commissioners were unable to lend the money, and as a result the amount put in the Votes in respect of the bonus fell short of the actual sum required by £3,200. £1,600 of that has been made up by savings out of the Votes, and the balance, £1,600, is the sum which is now asked for. I do not know whether I have made the matter sufficiently clear.

*Mr. MORTON said the present Government when in Opposition knocked £100 off the Irish Land Commissioners. Now they were putting it on again. He hoped the present Government would economise in dealing with our money in the management of Irish affairs. It should be understood that it was the money of the country which was being spent. He asked the present Secretary to bear in mind with regard to this matter that if he could reduce the cost of the government of Ireland by about a half he would get a better Government.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) rose to complain of the delay in the operations of the Land Commission in subdividing holdings under the Labourers' Act.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that question does not arise on this Estimate.

Mr. McKENNA said his hon. friend had asked about the £100. The deficiency which had to go upon the Votes would have been £3,200, but there had been a saving on the general expenditure of £1,600. Out of that saving he had put down £100.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) said it might not be regular under the Ruling of the Chair to go into the general question, but he might be permitted to answer the Question of the right hon. Member for S. Dublin with regard to the land regulations. The new regulations had already appeared in the *Gazette*, and there could be no objection at all to laying them on the table of the House.

Vote agreed to.

Class V.

6. £500 (Supplementary), Diplomatic and Consular Services.

*Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) called attention to the question of the publication of the diplomatic and consular reports which, he complained, were of no use to Ireland in the form in which they were published, although, he said, they could be made most useful. He pointed out that the reports gave no statistics as to the imports and exports to and from Ireland as distinct from England, but that the Consuls lumped all the figures together in a way that was perfectly bewildering; with the exception of the reports of the Consuls at Boston and Philadelphia he had seen none which were of real use to Ireland.

THE CHAIRMAN did not think the question to which the hon. Member referred was in order upon this Estimate.

*MR. MORTON asked why there should be so large an increase as £2,600 for the delimitation of the Anglo-German boundary east of Lake Victoria. Why had the Estimate for that purpose been exceeded by £2,600?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick) said that the excess amount of this Vote was caused by the fact that the Anglo-German Boundary Commission had undertaken more work than was originally anticipated, as well as occupying a longer time. The Joint Committee was despatched in July, 1902, for the delimitation of the Anglo-German boundary east of Lake Victoria, and in 1903 the British Commission found an opportunity of doing more work in the same region. It was cheaper to undertake the work by a Commission near the spot than by sending out a separate Commission. Finally, the Commission was detained a little longer than had been anticipated.

Vote agreed to.

7. £54,683, Newfoundland Fisheries Indemnity.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said the point at issue in this Amendment was an important one. Under the recent treaty with France we were conferring a great boon upon the people of Newfoundland, and he contended that the Newfoundlanders ought to pay this indemnity and not the people of Great Britain and Ireland. Many people argued that this was an Imperial matter, but who were the people who benefited? By the Treaty of 1783, the French were confirmed in certain rights over a large portion of the coast of Newfoundland. So strong was the confirmation that the English King undertook to prevent his subjects from disturbing the French fishermen by competition with them. In other words only a portion of the island was ours absolutely; our rights on the French shore were subject to the superior rights conceded to the French. The people of Newfoundland, when local self-government was conferred upon them, acquired only such rights as we before possessed. But they had never been content to accept that limitation, and had constantly been trying to oust the French. He did not altogether blame them. They believed there were minerals there, and believed that their position would be improved if the French were excluded. From the British point of view, however, their demand was extremely disagreeable, because it put us in the position of either appearing to evade our treaty with France or of being compelled to coerce our own Colony. In 1891 Lord Salisbury introduced in the House of Lords a Bill for coercing the Colony of Newfoundland because it refused to carry out the terms of the treaty with France. Lord Salisbury then pointed out that it was impossible to come to a settlement with France because of the unreasonableness of the demands of the Colonists. Now at last the Colonists had secured everything they asked for, but doubly at our cost. In the first place, in order to induce the French to go out of Newfoundland this country had conceded to France territory in the Colony of Gambia, a group of islands off the coast of West Africa, and a large slice of Northern Nigeria—all for the sake of 200,000 Newfoundlanders. In the second place the private rights of French fishermen had to be dealt with, and it was agreed that we should pay compensation, which had been fixed by arbitration at £54,000. This sum Parliament was now asked to pay in order to compensate the French fishermen for abstaining from fishing on the French shore of Newfoundland. But who benefited by that? Clearly the Newfoundlanders, and therefore they ought to pay. It was said that the Colony was poor, but he found that the Chief Justice of the Colony, writing not long ago, spoke of his own Colony as a "large and wealthy Colony" of British subjects. He repudiated the argument that because there were some poor people in Newfoundland that therefore the island should have something for nothing. It seemed to him an absolutely immoral doctrine. At whose expense were they to have it? Were there no poor people in England or Ireland? Irish fishermen would be taxed in order to increase the profits of the Newfoundland fishermen, who were probably much better off than were the Irish fishermen. This question also raised the whole issue of the way in which the late Government and former Governments lavished money on any Colony that chose to hold out its hand. In 1881 the Civil expenditure of the Colonies was only £72,000; in 1897 it was £294,000, and then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham discovered the Empire, and took charge of the Colonies, and during his administration the expenditure rose to nearly £1,500,000. This was one of the items of that huge expenditure placed upon the people of this country by the policy of always voting money whenever a Colony chose to ask for it, and though it might be said that this particular sum was small, he did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would speak with contempt of a sum of £50,000, and would be glad indeed to lay his hand on it. He ventured to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the stand he had taken with regard to economy generally, because it was not only from the Colonies, but from every quarter that little or big sums were being demanded, and, except the Chancellor of the Exchequer, there was no one to protect the money of the taxpayer or the credit of the country. It was said that this country could not go back—that the money had been already paid out of the Treasury chest and the chest must be filled up again. Yes, but there was nothing to prevent this country demanding from the Colony the repayment of money they clearly owed to us. He would like to press this point upon the Government, and, further, to urge that a stop should be put to the practice of allowing the Colonies to have everything they chose to ask for. We had for too long been pouring out our substance for the benefit of people whose natural resources were at least as great as our own, and whose burdens were very much lighter, but who, in spite of that fact, contributed not one penny to the expense of maintaining the Empire.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not for a moment question the right or propriety of my hon. friend in raising the merits of this question, but, at the same time, it is too late in the day now to go back on what has been done. It was arranged and understood and settled in the last House of Commons that the compensation which should be found due to the French fishermen for giving up the rights on the Treaty Shore of Newfoundland was to be paid by the House of Commons. The actual amount follows the general agreement with France, and that has been settled in the terms described by the agreement between the British and French Governments. The question whether the amount should be paid by the House of Commons or by the Colony is one which, I assume, was considered carefully by the late Government when they made the arrangements which have resulted in the present payment. I suppose what influenced them in deciding that it was the House of Commons they would ask to make this payment and not the self-governing Colony of Newfoundland was that they were engaged in a large operation of policy with regard to France, and that what they were making was not a settlement of individual matters each on its merits, but the settlement of one Imperial matter against another Imperial matter, the object of the whole being to arrive at a good and friendly understanding with the French Government. And so they regarded the whole as a matter of Imperial policy, with regard to which the conduct of negotiation, and even the adjustment of details, should be kept entirely in the hands of the Imperial Government. If they had made the payment of this money dependent on a vote of the Colonial Legislature, it would have been necessary to carry with them, step by step, in all the negotiations which resulted in the *entente*, the consent of the Colony. That would greatly have impeded the negotiations between his Majesty's Government and the French Government; and I would ask the Committee—if it be the case, as I am sure it is, that in this House of Commons the *entente* and understanding with the French Government is as popular as it was in the last House—not to press points of detail of this kind, which undoubtedly must raise difficult questions between the Imperial Government and the self-governing Colony. I think we have gone too far now to ask the Colony to pay this money. The last House of Commons passed an Act in which it was enacted that any sums payable by way of indemnity or for expenses incurred should be defrayed by Parliament. That was an announcement by the last Parliament to the Colony that we and not they would be responsible for the payment of the money when the actual sum had been determined. I do not think it is possible for this House of Commons to reverse what was done by the last House with respect to the Colony of Newfoundland. For the present House of Commons to resolve to go to the Colony and say, "We think the last House of Commons was too generous to you, and we mean to ask you to pay this £54,000 which the last House of Commons gave you to understand the Mother Country would pay"—that would be an unfortunate start in the relations of the present Parliament and the Colony. It would not be good business, and it would not be good policy. But I agree with my hon. friend to this extent—that I think the Colony ought to recognise that in dealing with this matter of Imperial policy we have dealt with them very generously; that the Mother Country has set them free from what was a great embarrassment and concern and difficulty. The old Treaty of Utrecht was originally a matter of Imperial policy, the new understanding with France has been regarded as a matter of Imperial policy, and Newfoundland has derived great benefit from the French rights being put into a form which is no longer embarrassing I hope the Colony will recognise, after this Vote is passed, that the Imperial Government has desired to deal very generously with them, and that in this matter of Imperial policy they have found Imperial interests so handled by the Mother Country as to confer considerable benefit on the Colony.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) thanked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for his admirable statement. He had not heard the whole of the speech by the hon. Member for Preston, but he was there to hear the hon. Member's concluding remarks, and he certainly disagreed with them. Newfoundland was the oldest of the great self-governing Colonies, and he knew from experience that the Colony laboured under the disadvantages of a very poor soil and a treacherous climate. The treaty as regarded the French shore of Newfoundland was decided without any consultation with the Colony. It dealt with a great grievance which had existed many years and might have caused severe complications involving us in misunderstanding, if not in warlike operations. The late Government in doing away with this long-standing grievance, this perpetual sore between the fishermen of Newfoundland and the French fishermen, did an enormous service to the relations between England and France. He was astonished that any hon. Member who had studied the subject at all should speak of our oldest Colony in the terms which had been used by the hon. Member for Preston.

*MR. MORTON did not agree that the money should be paid by the Colony. The Colony had nothing to do with creating the difficulty or the trouble. It was an Imperial matter, and he was pleased that the late and the present Governments had agreed that this was a proper sum to be paid from Imperial sources for the settlement of a grievance which had caused the expenditure of large sums of money otherwise, and had been a trouble, which, it was to be hoped by this Vote, would be ended. He hoped this country would be able to settle all its difficulties with foreign countries as easily as this one had been.

Vote agreed to.

8. £8,567, Samoa Arbitration Claims.

*MR. MORTON said he would like to know something about this new item of expenditure before it was passed.

SIR EDWARD GREY said his hon. friend had described this as a new item, but it was a very old story. In 1899 a state of civil war arose in Samoa, and the representatives of the British and American Governments on the spot took steps to deal with it. A certain amount of damage was done to property, and it was claimed that the British and American Governments were responsible for the damage caused by the action of their forces. The Germans also had a considerable number of subjects there who claimed for damage to their property. Although the arbitrator did not fix any sum, he established that the British and American Governments were responsible for the damage, and the British, American and German Governments were left to settle the matter as to the actual figures of the damages out of court. That took a considerable time, and it was only last April that the Foreign Office were in a position to estimate what the actual amount would be, and consequently they did not know that it would have to be paid out of the revenue for the present year. That was the reason why it was not included in the annual Estimates last year. It was agreed on behalf of Germany that something like £8,000 should be paid to German subjects, and this had been paid by the United States and this country. The United States had subjects whose property was damaged and so had this country, and it was agreed that each country should pay the claims of its own citizens. The British claims amounted to £3,635. Other small claims had been paid to Danish subjects, and that was how this item had arisen.

*MR. MORTON said he was exceedingly obliged to his right hon. friend for his very clear statement. He was sure it would be acknowledged that he was entitled to that explanation before his money went.

Progress reported.

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Ordered, that a Select Committee be appointed to control the arrangements for the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the Department of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of seventeen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of,—Mr. Barnard, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Dalziel, Viscount Helmsley, Mr. John Deans Hope, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Lea, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. McKillop, Mr. Power, Mr. William Redmond, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Walrond, and Mr. Osmond Williams.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting Mr. Speaker left the Chair until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

THE LAW OF TRUCK.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), in moving "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary to put an end to fines and deductions from wages," said it was perhaps a happy chance that the first occupation of time on the part of private Members of this House in the beginning of a new Parliament should be an occupation of time on behalf of a labour question of a practical description. This particular question of Truck was one of a severely painful kind, and it was also in the position of being ripe for further legislation. Timid legislation had been repeatedly tried in connection with this question and had repeatedly failed, and the time had come for heroic legislation. The question affected every class of labour in this country, including labour in shops and, for certain purposes, even agricultural labour, and the time had come when stronger remedies must be tried than had been tried in the past. The first Truck Act, the Act of 1831, was so good an Act that had it been enforced in modern times, had it not been killed by judge-made law, the country would have had very little to complain of. The abuses that had grown up under that Act, and which now could only be changed by heroic legislation, would have failed to have come into being at all. The Truck Act of 1831 if it was read by any Member of this House who had no acquaintance with it, either as a lawyer, a sucking statesman, or as an employer or one employed, would be satisfied with that Act. He would say it was a reasonable Act, and that there was little to complain of in it. Our legislation with regard to Truck seemed on the surface to be better than that of any other country of Europe, but the Truck Acts of Germany and those of Belgium and Russia, which were held to be the worst, were far better Acts than ours in the working. The principle of the Truck Act of 1831, which was the governing Act, forbade the payment of wage otherwise than in current coin of the realm: that was the first principle. The second principle was that the whole wage arranged should be paid with certain exceptions, which were distinctly named, such as for "miners' explosives," the exceptions to be agreed to in writing, and to be a sum not more than the actual value of the article, or cost, or loss, to the employer. That was a thoroughly clear law, and would have been satisfactory had it been acted upon, but it had unfortunately been upset by decisions in the Courts of law. Fourteen years after the Act of 1831, the first great case was decided, and decided against the intentions of that Act. The Act was virtually upset by a decision in the Courts of law where it was decided in a most extraordinary fashion that under the Act of 1831 it was legal to make deductions for "frame rents" in hosiery. Nothing came of that decision, which was in 1845, immediately, but in 1859 the full mischief of it was seen. In 1859 a case came before the Court in which there was a large number of fines and deductions. There were deductions for fire, for gas, for power, and what were called fines for discipline, for unpunctuality and so forth. All those things were involved in that case, and a most extraordinary result followed the first decision given with regard to it. The first decision was on the lines of the case of 1845. Then there was that appeal, which in the feeble state of the Trades Unions of that time had not followed the decision of 1845, and that appeal was heard before six judges who were divided three to three, with the result that the appeal failed. Two of the judges by whose action the appeal was dismissed said they felt great difficulty, but did not like to disturb the decision of the 1845 case after so many years. The third judge was Lord Bramwell, and anybody who remembered Lord Bramwell with his extraordinary intellect and absence of legal "tie" when he chose to put it on one side, would be amazed at the decision at which he arrived. Lord Bramwell used the argument he (Sir Charles Dilke) used to-day. Lord Bramwell explained how the Truck Act had been killed, and, having explained that there was therefore no law of Truck, said that he had to construct one out of his own inner consciousness, and the judgment of Lord Bramwell was one of the most remarkable that had ever been delivered from the Bench. The judgment in 1845 held good in the teeth of the statute, because in the appeal case of 1859 three judges decided in the way that he and others held to-day, and two judges agreed, but thought it ought not to be carried to extremes, while Lord Bramwell used the language to which he had referred. So things stood until the Trades Unions came into their own in 1874. In 1874 there was a weak Liberal Government followed by a weak Conservative Government, and one of the results of the power of Labour in 1874 was the carrying through this House unanimously of a sweeping Truck Act in respect to one particular trade, the hosiery trade. That abolished the whole of what were commonly called deductions: it abolished all fines and deductions with one exception. It was an Act applicable to a single trade and was not universally acted upon in connection with that trade. It was not known. It was procured through the instrumentality of the late Mr. Mundella, and was supposed to be applicable to Nottingham. In 1887, in the time of the Conservative Government, an Act was passed, and in 1889, in spite of the Act of 1887, the Home Office, although armed with that Act, failed, in every case they undertook, in trying to upset the judgment which had been referred to. After their failures in 1889 they stopped taking cases and said that, pending legislation, they were unable to do anything. In 1895 a Truck Act was proposed by a Liberal Government and brought in and passed by a Conservative Government in 1896, and most of the Members of the House were led by the legal advisers of the Home Office to support that Bill. Unfortunately, that Act had been a complete failure; its utter breakdown had been recognised. In 1897 the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Leicester brought in a Bill to repeal the Act of 1896, the first clause of which was—

> "The Truck Act of 1896 is hereby repealed."

It was a very ingenious Bill, and he did not think he was far wrong in saying that two of the most illustrious lawyers in the present Cabinet drew that Bill. That Bill, which was on a different principle to former Acts, did not succeed. The great case of 1889 was the case of Redgrave *v.* Kelly, in which case the Home Office had the advice of the Treasury lawyers and the whole of the legal talent of the Government at its back. It failed, and the Act of 1895–6 was prepared on the basis of the breakdown of that case, and they all had had good hopes of the result. He would now state to the House, without any attempt at adornment, a few of the cases which had been taken in recent times under the Act of 1896—the recent Act, together with the Act of 1831. He would take cases from Belfast, Birmingham, Edinburgh and London, and only cases for the year 1903, cases which had been taken by the inspectors of the Government themselves, and in regard to which answers had been given in the Home Office Reports or in this House. In Belfast there were three cases of soiling handkerchiefs in hemstitching, a work carried on largely by young girls at a small wage. In the first, a girl was fined 5s., her wage being 1s. a day. In the second case 1s. 5¾d. was stopped for soiling four dozen; the girl's wages for the work being 3d., she working at the rate of 9d. for twelve dozen. The third case was that of a girl aged fourteen. She had 8¾d. stopped, her wages being 2s. 10d. per week. Those three cases were held to be "reasonable," and the cases taken by the inspector at Belfast were dismissed. The next case he would take was one at Birmingham in the steel-pen trade, a case of "waste." In that case a girl was fined £2 for wastage, her wages being 12s. a week. The Edinburgh was a hosiery case; the case of a disciplinary fine for unpunctuality. The girl was absent for an hour: she was absent once, and once only. She was ill, and it was not contended that she was not. She was fined 7½d., her wages being 7s. a week. Although the German law was supposed to be the worst truck law in existence a case of this kind could not happen in Germany, because there no person could be fined more than a certain percentage. The last case was the London case, a case at the Guildhall of pressing in the tailoring trade. There a woman was fined £2 5s., and the extent of the fine was so huge in proportion to her wages that it was spread over two years. The only other class of cases he would like to mention were cases of an entirely new description which had come up lately; they were quite different to the others and more important; but they did not press in the same way, as those mentioned previously, on feeble women's industries. The first of this series was one that arose in 1904 at Oxford, where it was held legal to make stoppages for printed books containing the particulars required by law. That applied to the tickets upon which the particulars were put which a beneficent Government insisted upon. The case in the Potteries in 1904 was even more curious: in that it was held to be legal to make deductions for fees of certifying surgeons under the Acts. It was proved in court that the employer made a profit of £1 5s. the month, and inspectors had reported cases in which a profit of 100 per cent. was made on stoppage for certifying surgeons' fees. The most striking case of all was a Stroud Valley case, in which there had been deductions for insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act. In some cases twice and even thrice the amount of the insurance had been stopped. The Home Office took the case under the Act of 1831 and were defeated, and the decision was upheld on appeal.

But in 1905 in an appeal case of an inspector, "Squire *v.* the Midland Lace Co." in the King's Bench Division, before the Lord Chief Justice and two other Judges, the appeal failed, but the Court expressed the unusual opinion that the Truck Law should be amended, and in answer to a Question in the House on the 4th May the right hon. Member for St. Augustine's Division of Kent said the Home Office admitted the necessity of amending and consolidating the Truck Acts, and that they must be amended by this House. In May, 1904, the Home Office admitted that there must be an amendment of the Truck Acts. If he and those who acted with him had chosen to put down the Motion which was put down last session, and the session before, simply stating that in the opinion of the House drastic and immediate improvement of the law of truck was necessary, that Motion, he thought the Government would admit, would have been carried without a division in the House. It would be impossible to resist such a Motion, but some of them who had had this matter before them for years had thought that it would be more courageous on their part to try to commit the House, not to a vague resolution, but to put before the House the policy which he was sure alone would succeed. He was aware that there were difficulties, but they had been driven to this view by the failure of every other measure. If they were driven to make some exceptions to the rule, then he thought those exceptions should be voted on and clearly explained. Some people thought that it was necessary to preserve fines for the purposes of discipline, but the evidence of the Home Office inspectors was conclusively on the other side. The most experienced inspectors took the view that the best governed factories were those in which there were no fines, and the Home Office had also taken that view. The Home Office Reports had said that all cases of serious misconduct or injury to employer's property could be dealt with by other Acts of Parliament, notably the Employers and Workmen Act. If in a fiery mining district a man smoked down below, he was not fined under the Truck Acts, but under other Acts of Parliament, having been brought before a police court for an offence against the Mines Act. As he had said, also, the Employers and Workmen Act covered the great majority of these cases. A Board of Trade return stated that a most frequent cause of strikes was the system of excessive fines, and in factories, he need hardly say, the fines inflicted for purposes of discipline were a frequent source of tyranny. In shops these fines were pushed to a most absurd extent, and he had seen a book of over seventy disciplinary fines which were in existence in one shop. He had heard of another case in which the disciplinary fines were over 100. These fines pressed most heavily not upon the great trades but upon the less organised trades, such as the sweated women trades. As to the question of the exemption of the mining industry, some thought that the effect of the abolition of fines would be to break the miners' agreements. That point was raised in 1897 against the Bill of his hon. friends the Member for Leicester and the Member for the Ilkeston Division, but it was quite wrong. The miner is paid by weight of mineral obtained, and the deductions were from the weight of mineral and not from the wages. He had there a legal opinion which was perfectly clear on that point. An appeal had been made by an hon. friend of his on behalf of the Northern Miners' Permanent Relief Fund, and no doubt a distinction could be drawn in favour of deductions which went towards public purposes or to public bodies; but he saw great danger in introducing special clauses of that kind. There was an amazing case, the name of which he could not mention, because the matter was hushed up, with a view of recovering the money. It was that of a poor girl. A large sum of money was deducted for many, many years for hospital treatment, and it was found that not a penny of the money had gone to the hospital. He mentioned that as showing the danger of making an exception in cases where the money went to a good cause. If, however, it was necessary to make an exception to their general principle, let the exception be explained and distinctly made known to the House at the time it was made. He begged to move.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) in seconding the Motion said he thought the House would thank the right hon. Baronet for his clear exposition of the law of truck. He seconded this Resolution, because he was asked by his association, of which he happened to be acting secretary, to do so. His society was the Weavers' Association, and they had come to the conclusion that they should not be liable to fines of any description. It might be asked whether the Association was not strong enough to deal with the matter itself, but they did not want to have a strike every time a man resented a deduction from his wages. It was because they wanted to avoid strikes in the future that he seconded the Resolution. The abolition of truck gave the impression that wages were to be received in full, and the average workman was not aware of the legal decisions which had taken away the rights he thought the Truck Act had given him. They wanted to get back to the idea their forefathers had when they passed the Truck Act, that the workman should be handed over in money exactly what he had earned. If the system of fines were abolished the workman would still be liable for any damage he had done, and it would not mean that for every misdemeanour or fault of the operative the man must be discharged. He would be willing to pay what he recognised as a reasonable claim. He asked the House not to believe that the fines were necessary for discipline in the mills. There were no fines in any of the mills of the operative spinners, and there was no lack of discipline. At the election the Cotton Operatives Association made this a question and saw the candidates, and a good percentage of the men returned were willing to support the operatives' demand. At that time he knew that some of the candidates and some of the manufacturers expressed the view that the abolition of fines would relax discipline and go against the progress of the cotton industry; he claimed, on the contrary, that the system of fines had hampered its progress. But the men and the employers were on an equal footing, and the men would not be unreasonable in carrying out the law. He was willing to consider the claim of the miners to exemption; but he hoped the law would be clear that as a general rule fines should not be deducted, and especially those which simply went into the pockets of the employer. He maintained that where it was necessary to organise subscriptions for charitable objects the public spirit of the operative was good enough to secure that. When the workmen got his wages from the overlooker subscriptions could be got without any pressure.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary to put an end to fines and deductions from wages."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

*MR. BELL (Derby) thought that they were indebted to the right hon. Baronet for raising this question. Speaking for the railway employès of this country, he would point out that, although they were not subject to the same kind of deductions as those which had been mentioned, they had been subjected to fines for trivial offences. Four or five years ago, the London and North Western Railway adopted a far more severe and oppressive mode of punishment. Where the men were formerly fined 1s., 2s., or 2s. 6d., they were now suspended for one or two or even six days, and instead of having to pay 1s. or so the men lost 5s. or 6s. or 7s. a day. This system was far more oppressive upon the workmen than that adopted by other companies. On the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway during ten consecutive weeks from March 16 to May 18 last year at one station and in one Department alone —that of the Locomotive Department at Wigan—no less than ninety-five fines were imposed which amounted to £13 5s. 3d. There were also eighteen cases of suspension, amounting to ninety-eight days. Nearly all these were for trivial offences. The Midland Railway had also adopted this system. An engine-driver for smoking a pipe of tobacco upon his engine would formerly be fined 1s. or 2s., but recently the company had abolished this system of fine and adopted the system of suspension, so that the driver would nowadays lose 7s. or 8s. wages. The London and North Western, moreover, posted up a list giving the name of the individual, the offence he had committed, and the number of days for which he had been suspended. He found that in one week on the London and North Western Railway twenty-seven men were suspended sixty-three days, and seventeen of them were engine-drivers. The offences were most trivial, such as sticking with his goods train in the tunnel, extravagant use of stores when getting the engine ready, and the smoke nuisance. Upon another date he found that twenty-three men were suspended thirty-three days, and seventeen of them were drivers. Two men were suspended one day each because their engine happened to be blowing off steam in the station. It was almost impossible for an engine-driver who kept his engine up to the standard to avoid steam blowing off. Possibly some old timid lady might be alarmed on the platform by the steam blowing off, and if she complained the man would be suspended a day and thus fined from 7s. to 8s. according to his wages. In two other instances men were fined, or rather suspended for one day, for allowing the engines to emit smoke. Therefore it amounted to this—that a driver was suspended if he did not keep up steam, and in order to keep up steam to the standard he must consume a certain quantity of coal, and possibly in so doing the engine would emit a certain amount of smoke, and for this he was suspended. It was almost impossible for the men to know what was right and wrong, or what to do or not to do. Upon another date he found that thirty-nine men were suspended for fifty-nine days, and twenty-five of them were drivers, and ten of the offences were for allowing their engines to emit smoke. He thought hon. Members would agree with him that the emitting of smoke was not such a serious offence as to justify punishment to the extent of 6s., 7s., or 8s.. It was not necessary to inflict heavy penalties of that kind in order to enforce discipline. The treatment of the men by this company was such that people would hardly credit it unless they were acquainted with the facts as he knew them. There was one case in which a driver was concerned in a collision over which he had no control and he was suspended. Inquiries were held by the company's officials, and it was shown that this driver was not at fault. After he had been suspended for six days he was not allowed to resume his duties until he had signed the following form—

> "I,————do, this——day of———— agree to forego all claim, if any, from the London and North Western Railway Company for wages during the time I have been suspended from duty from————————to ————————, on condition that I may be allowed to resume work."

He ventured to think that the House would agree with him that that was a form of tyranny and punishment which no great corporation of respectable employers would tolerate for one moment. With regard to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, he was both for and against it in a sense. If penalties had to be inflicted for disciplinary purposes and if the effect of abolishing fines would be to substitute suspensions, he would rather see the fines retained. He felt sure that with all these heavy punishments inflicted by the railway companies upon their employees they got no more discipline and no more care than if they adopted less severe methods which would encourage the work people to take more interest in their employment. He knew that when a man had been suspended for paltry offences like those which he had described, he felt so aggrieved that he did not care whether he did his best for his employer or not. He hoped that the exposure which he had now given to the London and North Western Company's plan of enforcing discipline and the system of fines and suspensions adopted also by other great corporations would lead them to consider the adoption of some other method as an experiment which would induce the work people to take a greater interest in their work. He hoped the Home Secretary, when dealing with this subject, would consider whether something could not be done to prevent the harsh punishments to which he had referred, which were really an evasion of the Truck Act.

MR. J. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough) thought it would be as well if sea-faring men were included in any Amendment of the law, because he knew that in several large shipping companies the seamen were fined without any trial whatever. It had recently been brought to his notice that on some large Atlantic liners the stewards at the end of the voyage were charged as much as 15s. for lost linen and cutlery. It did not matter whether the responsibility could be fixed upon any particular person or not, for the whole lot were fined to make sure. He thought that was a very hard case indeed. If the Truck Act was applied to sea-faring men they might be able to get some relief in this direction.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland. Wansbeck) said he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean that there certainly was a case for a very strong remedy being applied for the removal of fines and deductions. It was very difficult for a layman to distinguish what was truck and what was not. In his own county they had deductions for various things, and he was not quite clear in his own mind as to whether they would come under the Truck Act or not. In the counties of Northumberland and Durham and Cleveland they had had for over forty years what was known as the Miners' Permanent Relief Fund for widows and orphans, and it also provided superannuation allowances for aged and infirm miners. Deductions for this purpose were made at every colliery from the wages of the miners. Would such deductions be regarded as truck? If so he would very much regret that any action which this House might take should interfere with an arrangement like that, because before they adopted the plan of having these deductions made from the wages in the office of the colliery the contributions of the workmen were very often neglected through carelessness, and when accidents happened it was frequently found that the workman had allowed his contributions to lapse, and when the widow expected relief it was often found that no compensation was forthcoming. Now that these contributions were deducted in the colliery office no such cases occurred; it had added considerably to the stability of the fund, and therefore he should regret any action which would interfere with or put an end to an arrangement of that kind. There were other deductions which might be regarded in the nature of fines, but they were arranged between the representatives of the workmen on the one hand and representatives of the employers on the other, and every precaution was taken to see that they were reasonable in their character, and that they are properly carried out. In the counties of Northumberland and Durham nearly all these deductions had been arranged at the request of the workmen themselves. No arbitrary deductions had been forced upon them by the employers, and he should protest very strongly against any employer forcing fines or deductions from wages in accordance with his own sweet will. As the miners stood upon terms of perfect equality with their employers in this respect, they were probably in a peculiar position as compared with other industries and other districts. He was not objecting so much to the terms or the principle of the Motion of his right hon. friend, but he was very anxious to guard and protect the interests of his own county and constituency in regard to a system which had grown up as the result of the experience of the past and been very successful. The miners had recently adopted nursing societies and paid their own nurses to attend serious cases of accidents and sickness. In order that the contribution for such purposes might be regular and sufficient to maintain these nursing institutions, appeals had been made to the colliery proprietors to stop a certain amount from each workman's wages to be handed over to some recognised official representing the workmen, and this system had been adopted and proved very economical because the cost of collection was saved. Nearly all these cases were matters of mutual and voluntary arrangement, and he did not know how far the Motion of his right hon. friend would affect that arrangement. He agreed with the suggestion that they should select certain cases of deductions and legalise them and place them outside the operation of the Truck Act altogether. That was an arrangement which he should certainly favour himself. He hoped, however, that nothing would be done to upset an arrangement which in his county had worked so well in the past, and which gave every prospect of working well in the future.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he hoped that if any alteration was to be made in the Truck Acts the Home Secretary would consider the case of the shop assistants. He knew that to a certain extent they were included, but the majority of those engaged in the distributing trade knew nothing about it. Shop assistants had inflicted upon them a system of living-in which would not be tolerated by any other workers in the country. The system of living-in was a vicious one, and carried with it the necessity of sleeping often under conditions inimical to good health, and it was not at all in the interests of the people who were compelled to submit to it. He had before him a list of fines inflicted in some of the shops of this great city which proved that the ingenuity of the employers had been taxed to the utmost to select cunning fines which were cruel in their operation. There was a fine of one shilling for not turning out the gas in the bedroom at the proper time. For exceeding time at meals the fine was 2d. and exceeding time for washing hands there was also a fine of 2d. A customer was not to be allowed to leave the shop unserved unless the shop walker was acquainted, and for breaches of this rule there was a fine of 6d. He could go on for long time enumerating fines which would not be tolerated amongst any other class of workers. Speaking for something like three-quarters of a million of people, he thought the time had come when the Home Secretary should make a very determined attempt to include the shop assistants of this country in any future legislation for the protection of the workers. The system of living-in was, in itself, a contravention of the spirit of the Truck Act. They were told that the original conception of the living-in system was a very healthy one; that it carried with it the idea of guardianship for boys and girls coming from the country, who would be exposed to the evils of large towns and cities. That might be true of the past, but only the vicious part of the system had been perpetuated. To-day the system of living in had degenerated to such an extent that it had become part of the business concern, and its only merit now was that it was an adjunct to the profits arising out of the business. The assistants were compelled to sit at a common table, they were subject to be called away at any time from their meals. The same class of food was given them, week by week, all the year round, with no variation except the day upon which the food was given. Another evil was that the living-in system gave to employers the right to give to their assistants food which, if sold to the public, would subject the salesman to the rigour of the law. A short time ago a case of this kind was tried in Bradford. It was proved conclusively that a large employer of shop labour had placed before his assistants food which was unfit for human consumption. A prosecution took place at the instance of the Bradford Corporation. and the stipendiary magistrate ruled that, while the food might not be fit for sale, it was fit for the assistants who were boarded by their employer. ["Shame."] Another evil was the insufficient accommodation provided for the assistants who had to live and sleep in. He hoped the Home Secretary would be able to give the same supervision to the living-in accommodation provided by large business establishments for the assistants as was extended to common lodging-houses. If the Home Office obtained such a power, he felt sure that a large number of the swell West End houses would soon find themselves brought into Court. This evil had become a public scandal and a grave danger to the health and well-being of the shop assistants, and it was a positive danger in case of fire. The system of fines and deductions was a blot upon our civilisation, and it pressed very heavily upon the slender earnings of the workers. Therefore, he beseeched the Home Secretary, when making any alteration in this Act, to include the workers in the whole of the distributing trades.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) thought the Home Secretary would have risen before this and given them some information as to the views of the Home Office upon this subject. This was a subject which was really worth the serious attention of the House, and one which must be dealt with sooner or later by the Government of the day. The original object of the Truck Act was to secure that the full amount of the wages should be paid to the worker. According to one of the best judges who ever presided in the English courts, Lord Bowen, the clear intention of the Truck Acts was to ensure to a workman his entire wages in actual current coin of the realm, unfettered by any obligation that it should be spent in any particular manner or in any particular shop—

> "The Legislature," said he, "endeavoured to secure that the workman might have in his hand the actual amount representing his wages, in order that he and his family might freely carry it home without impediment in the open market."

That would undoubtedly be the case if there were no qualifications. Not very long afterwards it was established that fines and deductions might be made other than those not specified in the Act. The hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division of Northumberland put a case which was almost, if not entirely, covered by the deductions now made legitimate by the Act of 1831, with the qualification that under Section 23 the workman must himself in his own hand sign the warrant of the employer to make good that deduction. He quite agreed with the hon. Baronet that the proper method of dealing with this matter was first of all to say that there must be no fines or deductions, that the entire amount of the wages must be paid in current coin of the realm, and that no portion of the wages must be withheld. In the case of contributions to provident and medical funds, an exception might be made, but these exceptions should be specified in the Act of Parliament, and should be only permitted when the workman authorised them in his own handwriting. How was it fines and deductions were first allowed? It was said they were not deductions at all from the wages. It was said by judges that they were a contract entered into, and that, therefore, the calculation of the fine was a mere step in the ascertainment of the wages. He thought the time had come when this system should be put an end to. It was true that the workman was protected in many instances by powerful unions, but it was equally true that in many cases where trades were not so well organised the workmen were not well treated. In certain specified cases, when the workmen might probably be induced to contribute either to a provident or medical fund, it would be unfair not to allow him of his own free will to enter into an arrangement. But it was monstrous that the system of fines should continue, because the very foundation of a system of fines was this—and it was fundamentally wrong—that the employer himself should be the judge not merely of non-attendance, but in the case of damaged goods. That was constituting the employer the judge in his own quarrel. Immediately a judicial system of fines was allowed, there was no practical prevention of their being part of the contract. What was the use of telling a workman who went to a factory that he could look at the list of fines? What he wanted was work and wages, and immediately the list of fines was put before him, if they were within the four corners of the Act, the workman took the contract. The only proper system was that which had been suggested by the right hon. Baronet, that there must be no fines and no deductions, subject to qualification. It was not in the Motion, but he understood from the right hon. Baronet's speech that he was willing to include such a clause. The deductions allowed ought to be very limited. There was a great deal to be said on this subject, but the speaking had all been on one side of the House. The Home Office, whose views the House was entitled to have, ought at the earliest possible opportunity to bring in a Bill, and not merely an amending Bill. It was no use bringing in a Bill to amend the existing Acts. Such a course would be a great inconvenience to all concerned, and would simply give a lot of work to lawyers. It should be a Bill which any ordinary intelligent man might understand. Therefore he urged the Home Secretary to advise the Government when the time came—and he hoped it would be very soon—to introduce a Bill directly dealing with the subject, and the foundation of that Bill should be that the whole of the wages must be paid without fines or deductions, that if deductions were to be allowed they ought to be of the most limited character and should be specified in the Act, and then allowed if only authorised by the employees of the particular trade.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): This question belongs to a class of subjects in which, I believe, the new Parliament will take a special interest. Many Members have come to the House in the hope that they will be privileged to take some part in legislation to remedy industrial grievances precisely such as those mentioned tonight, and I do not think the Home Office will fall short of these expectations. Perhaps those new Members will see with some disappointment, though not with surprise, the desolate condition of the Front Opposition Bench. The question of fines and deductions may seem to many of comparatively trivial importance, but it is these small, petty, but irritating grievances which frequently make all the difference between a state of comparative contentment and a state of constant bickerings and bitterness. It is often easier to bear a great hardship than a small injustice. Certain it is that these grievances cause a very real discontent, often disproportionate to their weight. My right hon. friend the Home Secretary is convinced that legislation on the subject is necessary, and legislation will certainly be introduced. The Act of 1896 aimed at securing that fines and deductions should be fair and reasonable, but the Act has failed in its purpose. Much, however, has been done. The inspectors have done their best with it, and figures show that in many respects large improvements have been made; but the inspectors have been greatly hampered by the limitations of the Act, and an extraordinarily large number of prosecutions under it have failed. In 1904 no fewer than 40 per cent. resulted in failure. As to deductions for premiums for insurance against liability under the Workmen's Compensation Act, it is clearly the intention of Parliament that the burden of insurance should rest on the employer. It has been mentioned that employers in various parts have deducted from their workmen sums of money for the purpose of paying the premiums of insurance, and cases have been quoted in which, though the premium was only 8s. the employer deducted 17s. per £100, and when the factory inspector prosecuted it was declared by the Court that such deduction was not illegal. The Factory Acts and the rules and regulations made by the Home Office have placed burdens on the employer, but in many cases, especially in the Potteries, the burden of carrying out those regulations has been thrown on the workpeople in the form of compulsory deductions from their wages. Employers have engaged persons to sweep the workplaces and keep the sanitary appliances in order, and have recouped themselves for the expense by means of these deductions. Here again prosecutions have been undertaken by the factory inspectors, and the deductions have been declared not to be illegal. In the boot industry many factory owners near Bristol make charges in the form of deductions for standing-room, light, and tools. Cases have been taken to Court by the inspectors. In the case of one woman, whose working wages were 14s. 6d. a week, the deductions amounted to 2s. 1d. for thread, standing-room, and use of machine, besides a penny to the doctor, and when this case came into Court, the defence was urged that the employer made no profit on the thread, and that as regarded the shilling for standing room and use of machine, he urged that considering the prime cost of the machine, £5, and the running and depreciation, and the light, rent, and rates of the factory, the charge was not excessive. Taking all these matters into consideration the Bench held that the employer was right, and the case was dismissed.

In the Potteries there are many survivals of a bye-gone system. Because fathers and grandfathers used to bring their own lanterns and candles to light them at work, now that gas has taken the place of such primitive methods workmen are required to pay for it. Because the grandfathers of the present generation paid assistants to turn their lathes and bring their materials, now that the steam engine does the same work, in a great many of the factories in the Potteries the workpeople are compelled to pay for providing and running the engines. It is impossible to tell whether deductions under some of these heads are fair or not, because the inspector has no power to call for the production of the gas bill or the rent-book of the factory owner, and it is impossible to say to what extent the workpeople are imposed upon in these ways. The right hon. Baronet also mentioned the extreme hardships that occur in relation to charges made for damaged goods. Workpeople are often compelled, for some slight fault in a garment, to purchase from the employer the article at its full value. Occasionally they are able to dispose of it, and the loss might not be so great, but this is not always the case. During the South African war there were many cases of khaki suits made for the soldiers being defective in some slight measure, and the unfortunate out-workers were compelled to pay their value without being able to recoup themselves. The reports of the factory inspectors are full of instances of fines which ordinary magistrates would consider unreasonable and unfair. An old woman, who was paid 6s. a week for cleaning a factory, was charged 1s. 6d. out of that amount for the rent of a dirty dilapidated room belonging to her employer, and an extra shilling a week for being late in the morning, so that the sum she received, after the deductions, was 3s. 6d. a week. This case was prosecuted by a lady inspector, and the magistrates dismissed the claim on the ground that these deductions were not unreasonable, and the employer promptly dismissed the woman. These things ought to be impossible. They are not impossible at the present time, and therefore the House must legislate to make them impossible. I have not exhausted the number of instances in which general grievances arise. The Act says that fines must be for specific acts or omissions.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS: That is done now. It will not do at all.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I venture to point out that it is not done now. I am not saying that the Act, as it stands, is sufficient to carry out the express purpose for which it is made. In a certain factory a notice was exhibited that workers must observe due order and decorum in the factory, and should in all respects obey the lawful demands of the manager, forewoman, or superintendent, and that they were to be subject to fines if in any degree they infringed any part of so sweeping and vague a regulation. The case was taken into Court, and it was urged that it was not a specific statement of acts and omissions for which ,fines should be inflicted, but the Court of Appeal held to the contrary, and that case was sufficient to rob the Act of 1896 of its utility. Then, again, there are three large groups of workers wholly excluded from the benefits of the Act. There is the case of the shops, where there are frequently as many as 200 rules to be observed, and for the infringement of which an assistant may be fined. He would be indeed an immaculate being who could tread his way through without breaking a single rule. Shops under the Truck Act are a peculiar instance of the hiatus of the law. Inspectors under the Act may enforce the Truck Act, but may not enter shops. Shop inspectors may enter shops, but cannot enforce the Truck Act. There is, therefore, no proper source of inspection, and shop assistants cannot take action, for fear of dismissal without a character. The whole of the cotton industry is exempted at the request of those engaged, which is not perhaps altogether wise. Thirdly, the great class of out-workers is excluded from all the Truck Acts, although they are the most poverty-stricken of all, the least organised, and the most open to oppression, and the class which should especially receive the care and solicitude of the House. The Court of King's Bench in a recent decision, in almost unprecedented circumstances, made the suggestion to Parliament that it was high time that the Act should be amended if only to bring in this great body of out-workers. I do not believe that good employers will object to legislation to get rid of the abuses that prevail. Harsh treatment does not make a good workman, and the great majority of employers are far too considerate and far too sensible to permit injustices of the description I have quoted in their works. But the Truck Acts, like the Factory Acts, have no concern with the majority who do right; they are intended for the reproof and correction of the minority who do wrong. For these and similar reasons my right hon. friend has decided to bring in a Bill to amend the Truck Act, but not this year. The Government has the Workmen's Compensation Bill and the Trade Union Bill to deal with this Session. But my right hon. friend intends to introduce and hopes to pass a measure to amend the Truck Act in the next session of Parliament. The interval between now and then might be properly used for an inquiry into the whole subject and for collecting further information. I wish it were possible to accept the easy and simple solution which is proposed by the right hon. Baronet straight off and without further examination, but as the right hon. Baronet himself recognises, the matter is not so simple as it appears at first sight. With regard to the system of deductions, such as was mentioned by the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division of Northumberland in the case of miners, the employers are used as a collecting agency, so to speak, for a number of institutions in which the miners are interested. If the Motion of the right hon. Baronet were carried the whole of this system, which largely prevails in the mining districts, would be swept away, to the great disadvantage, I believe, of both employers and employed. Then in the case of goods which are given to out-workers and damage is done, the House will need to be quite sure, before prohibiting any form of deduction, that they are not precipitating a system which may be still worse. Supposing it were found that employers, whose work was damaged, were unable to get any redress except by prosecution, a system might arise whereby employers would refuse to give out work unless the workers paid a deposit to cover any liability that might fall on the employer in consequence of damage to goods, and that might cause a great hardship to be inflicted on out-workers. We must be sure, too, that legislation would be able to be enforced and would prevent secret arrangements between employers and employed that damage when done should be paid for in the form of deductions from wages. For my part I hope the inquiry will prove the possibility of prohibiting all sorts of fines, but sweeping and hasty legislation in that direction might have undesirable consequences. We find in the factory inspectors' reports that large numbers of the better managed laundries have abolished fines altogether, and that the discipline of the workers has not at all been affected. We find that the manager of the London and North Western Railway, Sir F. Harrison, said before the Commission on Accidents on Railways that—

> "fines of small amount which generally used to be the custom are a very objectionable and very irritating kind of punishment."

That railway company decided to abolish fines altogether.

*MR. BELL: In my remarks just now I pointed out that the general manager of the London and North Western Railway had adopted a more severe form of punishment by suspension, which was far more expensive to the workman.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: That, you can see, is what may be the unforeseen result of sweeping legislation of this character. The hon. Member for Derby, who represents the railway servants, has pointed out that the result of the abolition of fines has been to impose far heavier punishments on the workmen, and far greater financial results. I gather from him that if he had his choice between the system of suspension on the one hand and fines on the other, he would rather have the fines with their irritation than suspensions with their heavy loss. Further, there is the question of offences committed by workpeople in the form of breaches of special rules made for their own safety and the safety of those who work with them. The Home Office is constantly instituting special rules to secure greater safety in dangerous trades. Occasionally workers transgress against these rules. They must be compelled in some way to conform to the proper requirements of the law. Are they to be prosecuted in every case, however trifling? Of course they must be prosecuted in grave cases, but trifling cases might possibly be met more expeditiously and more satisfactorily by fine than by prosecution. The matter has also to be considered whether by abolishing fines you will not be making employment far less secure—whether it will not become more usual for employers to dismiss workpeople for small and trivial offences. I believe that in great shops where fines are not in vogue the position of the workmen is far more precarious. I do not wish to prejudge the inquiry. For my own part I again express the hope that it may be possible *simpliciter* to abolish all fines, but I do suggest that this House would be ill-advised to decide to-night without inquiry that all fines and all deductions should necessarily be abolished in every case. In these circumstances it is impossible to accept the Resolution of the right hon. Baronet in the form in which it now stands. It is too wide in one direction, and in another direction it is too narrow. The hon. Member for the Newton Division of Lancashire observed that no amendment of the Truck Act could be in any degree satisfactory which did not take into consideration the system of "living-in" in shops. Here again you have the survival of an old system. In industrial establishments employing scores and hundreds of assistants you have the old system which existed when the shopkeeper employed just one or two assistants who lived in his home as members of the family and dined at his board. This system may, and I believe does, give rise to very grave abuses. The assistant must live in the employer's boarding house. The food may be bad and the accommodation inferior. There may be no privacy and many irritating restrictions, but he cannot change his lodgings without losing his situation. On the other hand, the system has its advantages. There are many of these places in which I believe the accommodation is excellent, and in which the employer makes, and seeks to make, no profit, and where the assistants are quite content. Then there are numbers of young women who come to London and who are engaged as shop assistants who would rather find lodgings with a respectable firm than be compelled to go perhaps to somewhat doubtful lodgings. There is also the special case of the seaside towns and watering places. They in the summer have a largely increased staff of shop assistants, and it is the custom to take these extra assistants to lodge in the shopkeeper's house because in many cases lodgings are specially difficult to obtain and are specially dear. It would cause extreme inconvenience if, by a simple enactment, you were to sweep away this system wherever it prevails. Further, it is necessary, as the hon. Member has pointed out, that any amendment of the Truck Acts should endeavour to consolidate and simplify the Acts which now stand on the Statute-book. I hope that may be possible. I cannot give any pledge on the subject of sweeping away all the Acts as they now exist and re-enacting truck legislation *de novo*. But the failure to comply with the Acts is often due to the failure to comprehend them. They are a maze of narrow and tortuous legal paths in which few find their way, and it may be necessary to cut a clean straight road through this tangle of legislation. There has been no inquiry into the working of the Truck Acts for the last thirty-five years, and my right hon. friend proposes forthwith to appoint a Committee to investigate these various questions. It will involve no delay, because in any case I hope that the inquiry may be completed before the next session of Parliament begins. Such an inquiry should not be made by a merely departmental and official Committee, and my right hon. friend was inclined to recommend the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into this matter. But there are three reasons why such a course might not be satisfactory. This is a matter in which the assistance of women is required in regard to the question of deductions from wages, out workers, and all those things specially calling for such assistance. A Select Committee would be deprived of such assistance, because we are not yet privileged to number ladies among our members. Secondly, it is desirable that the inquiry should be concluded within this year for the reason I have given. I doubt whether it can be concluded within this session. Thirdly, it is advisable that the Committee should have at its disposal the great store of information on this subject which the Home Office has collected. Therefore, as at present advised, my right hon. friend will propose the appointment of a Departmental Committee in name, but not in composition, with its chairman and the majority drawn from outside the department concerned, and including women among its members. I trust that under these circumstances my right hon. friend the mover of the Resolution and the hon. Member for the Clitheroe Division will not think it necessary to press this Resolution in its present form, assured, as they may be, that the Government is as desirous as they are of securing at the earliest possible date a comprehensive, well considered, and effective amendment of the Truck Acts. I believe that this House has given to the nation no greater boon than that beneficent code, so gradually and laboriously created, of industrial law which is to be found in the Factory Acts, the Mines Acts, the laws affecting the working of railways, compensation for accidents, and the Truck Acts, and the House may be confident that those who are now responsible for the Home Office will not be found lacking either in the will or the ambition to carry to its proper development so much of this social reform as is entrusted to their charge.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE (City of London) said he should be sorry if this interesting debate were brought to a close without a few words being said from the Opposition side of the House. Those words would be entirely sympathetic with the position taken up by the Under-Secretary. There was every reason why he and his friends should be sympathetic in this matter, for a great mass of that large body of legislation which had been passed for the improvement of the condition of the working classes had been given to the country by the Conservative Party. [Laughter, and cries of "Oh."] Only those laughed who did not know the history of these matters. The Factory Acts were in a great measure owing to the Conservative Party. [AN HON. MEMBER: Ashley.] Lord Ashley was a staunch Conservative. While he did not wish in any degree to draw a distinction between parties in the matter discussed to-night, he could not help congratulating himself and those who thought with him that the Acts of 1887 and 1896 were both owing to a Conservative administration. But it was said that they had been a failure. At all events they had been the best efforts made in that direction, and if they had not been completely successful, they had failed, not through the weakness of the legislation, but by the difficulties which from time to time had arisen in giving effect to these Acts. What did more towards abolishing the abominations of the truck system in this country than any dozen Acts was Mr. Disraeli's novel "Sibyl," which brought home to the people the horrors of the system. He was glad indeed it had been decided that a Bill should be introduced. A Committee was to be appointed—the present Government was already fruitful in Committees—and he did not in the least object to the careful discussion and consideration of important matters like this, but he confessed he thought that on this matter the facts were pretty well ascertained. If it was really intended to appoint a Committee, he hoped it would be done promptly, so that the Committee might report and a Bill be introduced dealing with the matter before the end of the present session. If the Committee sat during the present year, and if the Bill came fresh to the House next session, it would not get the consideration which it would otherwise receive. He thought a great deal would be gained if the Bill could be laid before the House before the close of this session. It could be examined between then and the beginning of next session. He ventured to commend that course to the consideration of the Government. His hon. friend opposite might be quite sure that he would have no lack of support in this House in endeavouring to deal with the difficulties which did exist. That there were difficulties no one who heard the speech of the hon. Member for Derby could doubt. If this Resolution were to be proposed to the House in the form in which the hon. Member desired, it would not only forbid fines and deductions from wages, but suspension from duty as a punishment for small offences. If it did so, it would have the very serious defect which was pointed out by the Under-Secretary, who spoke on behalf of the Government, that employers unable to inflict small penalties for small offences might be obliged in self-defence to dismiss a man when the offence he had committed was one which might have been met by a small fine or by a slight suspension. That was a practical difficulty which he had no doubt would be carefully considered by the committee to be appointed.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite seems to think that there is no necessity for the Committee which we propose to appoint, but I would really suggest to him that there is one subject alone which has been referred to to-night in the interesting and instructive speech of the hon. Member for the Newton Division of Lancashire—the subject of "living in"—requires inquiry before being dealt with. I do not propose to indicate any opinion at present in regard to the system of living in, or what changes might be proposed to accommodate those who now live in these places. I rise now for the purpose of making a suggestion, because there has been practical unanimity on the part of all who have spoken to-night. My hon. friend the Under-Secretary, in his very able and interesting speech, has really indicated the spirit in which the Government will approach this question, and it is desirable that we should agree on the Motion before the House. I, therefore, propose practically to accept in principle the Motion of my right hon. friend, but to add at the end—

> "Other than such as may be specifically legalised by Parliament."

I hope that that will meet with general support.

Amendment proposed—

> "At the end of the Question, to add the words 'other than such as may be specially legalised by Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he was not sure that the words suggested by the Home Secretary would do much to get over the difficulties in this matter. In the Mines Regulation Act there were certain subjects specified and rules laid down for ascertaining what the deductions ought to be. Everything was provided that the ingenuity of man could suggest to ensure that fines for dirty coal should be fair and legitimate. It was also provided that deductions should not be made until mutually agreed upon between employer and employed. There was also an inspector fully empowered to enforce the provisions of the Mines Act, but in face of all that he could give instances where the Act had been practically a dead letter. He instanced a case in which the miners refused to accept a scale of deductions which they considered exorbitant, with the result that they were locked out for six weeks. They resumed work under the scale proposed by the employer, and a case was taken into Court to test the legality of the scale. The Court held that the fact that the men went back to work knowing the scale to be in existence was proof that they had accepted it. No matter how much they might safeguard fines and deductions, there would be difficulty. It seemed to him that there was one safe guiding rule in this matter, namely, that no fines or deductions should be allowed which in any way benefited the employer. Deductions for hospitals, infirmaries, doctors, pick sharpening, and other things, could be made without difficulty if handed to a committee of workmen to be applied to the purposes for which they were made. He suggested that the difficulty might be got over if there was no possibility of bad and greedy employers getting advantage from fines imposed under provisions made to safeguard the interests of the workmen. If that idea could be embodied in the Resolution now before the House, and introduced into the Bill, it might lead to a solution of this very difficult question.

*MR. J. JOHNSON (Gateshead) said the workmen's representatives were all deeply grateful to the right hon. Baronet for bringing this question before the House. He had done this at considerable labour to himself, and he had certainly conferred a signal benefit on the Labour Members of the House. The right hon. Baronet had instanced some glaring cases of hardship from the infliction of fines and the making of deductions. When he came to the House he had considerable doubt as to the advisability of carrying the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman *in toto*, but after the speeches to which he had listened, his trepidation on the matter had disappeared. He thought a Member should not be always anxious to get what he conceived to be the precise form of the particular legislation he desired, and that he should waive, to a certain extent, special interests in order to fall in with the general concensus of opinion. In view of the hardship which the system of deductions inflicted on the weakest members of the community, on women and girls, it was incumbent on the Government to take the earliest opportunity of introducing legislation on the subject. The Under-Secretary in his very able statement had given evidence of his sympathy. He was thankful also to the hon. and learned Member on the Front Opposition Bench for his sympathy, although he might add that it came very late in the day. All the facts regarding the hardships suffered by the workpeople of which they had heard that evening must have been under the cognisance of the late Government for the last ten years. He did not want to say anything derogatory of the magistracy, except that they showed so little fellow-feeling when cases between workmen and employers came before the Bench. It required an overwhelming case before the workmen got the benefit of any doubt. He only wished that they, as workmen, should make an earnest endeavour to get some of their own kith and kin on the magisterial Bench, in order that they might have a little more humane interpretation of the law, not in favour of the workman, but in favour of justice and right. The glaring instances which had been given that evening by the right hon. Baronet and by the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department were such that there ought to have been some disposition on the part of the Government to restrain the magistrates from giving such verdicts and sentences. He hoped that the workmen in this House would, in season and out of season, press this Government, or any Government, to introduce legislation that would restrain capricious employers of labour from inflicting fines which were not only a deterrent of the employés, but cut into the very means of their existence. He, and all his fellow trade unionists, were highly gratified at the tone which the debate had taken, and for the words of sympathy which they had not been in the habit of listening to for many years; and he trusted that these would be followed by legislation which would improve the conditions of life of the working people of the country.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said the hon. Member for the City of London who spoke from the Front Opposition Bench had claimed that preceeding Truck Acts and all other measures for the benefit of the working classes of the country had been passed by the Conservative Party. That was a mistake. The Amending Truck Act of 1887 was the work of Mr. Bradlaugh, and Mr. Bradlaugh was certainly not a Member of the Conservative Party. There were Members of the present House who took part in the debates on that measure and who made serious efforts to amend the Bill on the lines of the Resolution now under discussion. He himself had moved several Amendments to the Bill with that object in view, but the Conservative Government of the day resisted them, and unfortunately they failed, so that when the Bill became law it was so limited in its operation, as to be practically useless.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said there was another matter which he wished to bring to the recollection of the hon. and learned Member for the City of London, whom he might congratulate on having now a colleague in this House, when he stated that all the beneficial working class legislation had been passed by the Conservative Party.

SIR E. CLARKE: I did not say all.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT: Nearly all.

SIR E. CLARKE: I said the greater part.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT: Well, the greater part. To his mind that was only one of the fictions which it was thought worth while by some people to circulate from time to time from the platform, and he rather thought it need not have been introduced into this debate. He wished to make one or two observations on the subject of the Resolution before the House, which he had studied for many years. The hon. Member for the Newton Division for Lancashire who had made a very interesting speech, fell into a slight error when he said that the Truck Act did not apply to shops, that the factory inspectors were not allowed to enter the shops, and that they could not put the Act into force. He wished to point out that under the existing law the inspectors under the Shop Hours Act only were at liberty to enter shops, but the Act was almost a dead letter because there were so few of these inspectors. The only method of enforcing the Act was to see that the terms of notice or contract and the list of fines were put up in the shops. If an inspector proceeded against an employer for neglect to put up particular notices or the terms of the contract signed by the workpeople, the employer, through the solicitor defending him, almost invariably pleaded guilty, but said that it was merely a technical offence, and a merely nominal fine was imposed. That was the only means of getting at an employer at all, although it might be the case that a workman had been fined a hundred times in sixpences to recoup half a crown. He put this point before the Government so that there might be in their minds the danger which resided in the words of the Amendment to the Motion of his right hon. friend. Those words would not save the situation, and he thought they would have gone the whole hog and abolish fines altogether. From the first part of the able speech of the Under-Secretary he imagined that he could come to no other conclusion than that the hon. Gentleman was going to abolish fines altogether; but then the hon. Gentleman went on to say that it was not an easy question to decide whether it was harder to bear fines or to have dismissal or suspension. Enough, however, had been said to show that this subject was eminently one fitted for the consideration of a Committee, and he was glad to hear that such a Committee was to be appointed.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that as an employer of labour he could heartily endorse much that had been said during the debate, but it must be remembered that if there were bad employers as well as good, there were also bad trade unionists as well as good trade unionists. He knew that many employers desired to raise the standard of living amongst their workpeople, and to see them industrially organised. He himself wished that what were called casual labourers were better organised. He had no objection to arrangements as to fines being made jointly by employers and employed, and that if fines were retained, that they should be devoted to the charitable institutions of the district. The latter was a principle which if more generally acted upon would meet the case, and was already practised in the Clyde district.

Amendment proposed—

"That the words 'other than such as may be specifically legalised by Parliament,' be added to the Motion."—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that these words were very much on the line of the suggestions he had thrown out at the end of his speech, and he could therefore offer no objection to them.

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary to put an end to fines and deductions from wages other than such as may be specially legalised by Parliament.

VOTING DISQUALIFICATION (POOR LAW) REMOVAL BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) moved the Second Reading of the Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill. Everyone, he said, knew that the working classes attributed great value to the possession of a vote as had been shown at the late Parliamentary election; but if a man accepted poor law relief he lost his vote. The Bill before the House did not recommend any extreme measures. It seemed to him simply just and natural that the man who, being in distress through loss of health, or old age, got relief should not lose thereby his vote. The Bill was presented to the last Parliament and received support from all parts of the House. He hoped that it would not now receive any opposition from either side, and therefore he moved that it be read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed—"That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby): May I ask if this is a Government measure?

MR. SCHWANN: The hon. Gentleman knows that it is not.

MR. WHITLEY said he wished to ask whether the Bill applied to those over a certain age who received poor law relief or whether it applied to all cases. A Poor Law Commission was sitting at present on this question, and it appeared to him that it would hardly be fair to that Commission if this Bill were passed without full explanation. He himself had been quite unable to hear what the hon. Gentleman had said in explanation of the provisions of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that they had not heard from the hon. Member who brought this Bill forward any description of the different kinds of people who came on the poor law for relief. Undoubtedly from time to time a number of deserving people were obliged by necessity to seek relief from the poor law — men who had broken down through disease or who had been overtaken by old age. He could understand in cases of that kind that it would be unfair and unjust that these men should be deprived of their rights as citizens. But on the other hand, there were tramps, vagrants of all kinds, and objectionable characters who sought poor law relief, and fortunately the law at present deprived them of their right to the exercise of the franchise. He could understand that there would be an unanimous feeling in all parts of the House to grant a Second

Reading to the Bill if it made a discrimination between these two classes who obtained poor law relief; but if there was no discrimination, and having regard to the fact that a Commission on the question was sitting, he thought it was inopportune to bring forward this Bill in such an incomplete and unsatisfactory condition. This was a subject which ought not to be dealt with by a private Member or in a piecemeal manner, and he trusted that the Bill would not be persevered with that night.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said it was a matter for extreme regret that the time was so limited in which they could discuss a measure, the substantial object of which the majority of the Members in the House were in favour of. It being now only a few minutes to twelve o'clock, it was impossible to give the Bill the consideration which it deserved. There was much to be said for the argument of the hon. Member opposite who contended that such a measure should not be a private Member's Bill, but that it should be brought forward by the Government. It would have been better if they had had an opportunity of knowing to what classes of people this Bill would apply. For instance, in the memorandum attached to the Bill it was said that the Bill was intended to apply to workmen employed on relief works; but that class of person did not now labour under any disqualification. Under the Unemployed Workman's Act of last session a workman was entitled to exercise his vote in a proper and legitimate way. Again, a man in receipt of medical relief from the board of guardians did not in consequence thereof lose his vote either for a Parliamentary or municipal election.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

Mr William Rutherford.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

By virtue of an Act passed in the twenty-fourth year of the reign of His late Majesty King George the Third, intituled, "An Act to repeal so much of two Acts made in the tenth and fifteenth years of the reign of His present Majesty, as authorises the Speaker of the House of Commons to issue His Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown for making out Writs for the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, in the manner therein mentioned, and for substituting other provisions for the like purpose."

I do hereby nominate, appoint, and authorise—The right hon. George Finch, the right hon. Thomas Burt, the right hon. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Sir James Kitson, and Sir John Brunner, being Members of the House of Commons, or any one or more of them, to execute all and singular the powers given to the Speaker of the House of Commons for the time being, for issuing Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown, in the cases as in the said Act specified.

Given under my hand and seal, this twenty-seventh day of February, in year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and six.

JAMES W. LOWTHER,

(L. S.) *Speaker.*

27 February 1906.

In pursuance of Standing Order No. 1, "Sittings of the House."

I hereby nominate—The right hon. Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Edward Blake, Sir William Holland, Mr. Charles Fenwick, and Mr. Alfred Hutton, to act during this session as temporary Chairmen of Committees when requested by the Chairman of Ways and Means.

JAMES W. LOWTHER,

Speaker.

27 February 1906.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 28th February, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; London Outer Circle Railway Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill, read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.

Petition from North Durham, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL).

Petitions in favour; from Bethnal Green, Eccles, and Forres; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR TAX.

Petition from Sheffield, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Petition of the Trustees of the British Museum (King's Recommendation signified), for grant-in-aid; referred to the Committee of Supply.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Paper [presented 27th February] to be printed. [No. 63.]

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Inland) Regulations, 1905, dated 12th October 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 6) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th September, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL DEBT (SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES).

Annual Account presented, for the period ended 20th November, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 64.]

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.

Copy presented, of Financial Statements of the British South Africa Company for 1902–3, 1903–4, 1904–5, and Estimates for 1903-4, 1904–5, and 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.

Copy presented, of Report to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage, by Sir Alexander R. Binnie [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS 1906-7 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 65.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Private Bills, Copy of Rules for the Practice and Procedure of the Referees on Private Bills [in pursuance of Standing Order 88]; to be printed. [No. 66.]

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Account ordered, "of the Income and Expenditure of the British Museum (Special Trust Funds) for the year ending the 31st day of March 1906; and return of the number of persons admitted to visit the Museum and the British Museum (Natural History) in each year from 1900 to 1905, both years inclusive; together with a statement of the progress made in the arrangement and description of the collections; and an account of objects added to them in the year 1905."—(*Mr. Rothschild.*)

RAILWAY, ETC., BILLS.

Copy ordered, "of Report by Board of Trade upon all the Bills and Provisional Orders of Session 1906 relating to railways, canals, tramways, harbours, and tidal waters, and the supply of electricity, gas, and water."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (MONTHLY STATEMENTS).

Copy ordered, "of statements for each month of the year 1906 of the number of paupers relieved in England and Wales (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 40, of Session 1905)." — (*Mr. Runciman.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Proposed Government Amendments to Transvaal Labour Ordinance.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the amendments which the Government have decided to introduce into the Transvaal Ordinance of 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The method by which the decision of the Government in this matter can most conveniently be carried into effect is still under consideration, and a full statement of the steps to be taken will be made in due course. There will then be no objection to laying the text of the alterations upon the Table of the House.

Veto of Home Government on Legislation of Self-Governing Colonies.

COLONEL LEGGE: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies on how many occasions since the year 1855 the Crown has exercised the right of veto on legislation by the self-governing Colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) A Return, supplementary to House of Commons Return No. 362, of 1901, will be presented to Parliament if the hon. Member will move for such a Return.

Lord Milner and Corporal Punishment of Chinese Labourers.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Lord Milner's attention has now been called to the statements contained in Blue-books (Cd. 2819 and Cd. 2786) that prior to June 1905, corporal punishment had been inflicted by the mine authorities of the Witwatersrand upon their Chinese labourers, and that this took place with his knowledge and sanction; whether, seeing that this corporal punishment was in direct contravention of the assurances given, in February 1904, by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton to the Chinese Minister in London, and telegraphed to Lord Milner, Lord Milner has been asked for any explanation of his conduct, and, if so, what is the nature of his explanation.

(*Answered by Mr Churchill.*) I desire to refer the hon. Member to the statement offered by Lord Milner yesterday in another place.

Chinese Labourers—Punishment of the "Cangue."

MR. MACKARNESS: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say whether the form of punishment called the cangue, or head collar, inflicted as stated in Blue-book (Cd. 2819, p. 22) on Chinese labourers in the mines in the Witwatersrand, was inflicted by the mine authorities with the knowledge or sanction of any official then holding office under the Crown; and, if so, who was the official, and has he been called on for an explanation of his conduct.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) No, Sir; there is nothing to show that this form of punishment was inflicted with the knowledge or sanction of an official.

Government Contracts for Ordnance Work.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been directed to the rule established by Mr. Secretary Stanhope, in view of the capital expenditure incurred by the great ordnance firms of Sheffield and Newcastle in response to Government invitation, that two-thirds of the War Office requirements for ordnance should be placed with the trade and one-third with the ordnance factories; and, having regard to the precedents established by successive Secretaries of State, he will undertake himself to abide by the rule.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The practice laid bown by Mr. Secretary Stanhope was probably a wise one, though it cannot be said to be based on any abstract rule. I may, however, say that there is not at present any intention of disturbing the practice of the department in this respect.

Transvaal Garrison.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): To ask the Secretary of State for War if Imperial troops are to be retained in the Transvaal when it has become a self-governing Colony.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The conditions prevailing in the Transvaal are for the time being exceptional and unprecendented, and any disposition of Imperial forces which may be deemed necessary for the effective maintenance of public security will not be affected by the constitutional changes which are in contemplation.

Royal Irish Rifles Militia Training.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the inconvenience and loss of civil pay occasioned to men of the Militia battalions, Royal Irish Rifles, by having to assemble for annual training in the middle of one week and to disband in the middle of another week; and whether he will give instructions that, in future, the four Royal Irish Rifles Militia battalions be assembled on a Monday and disbanded on a Saturday.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not aware of any inconvenience having been caused by the arrangements for the training of these Militia battalions. These matters are entirely in the hands of the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief; but I will cause inquiries to be made and will communicate the result of these inquiries to the hon. and gallant Member.

Effect of New German Tariff on British Goods.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the result of the representations made to the German Government with reference to the new tariff which comes into force to-morrow against British goods, and particularly if the enhanced duty of 20s. per cwt. upon a certain class of files made in Sheffield will be withdrawn in favour of the present duty of 7s. 6d. per cwt., or a less duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Since the representations referred to were made to the German Government a number of reductions in the German tariff have been made. It is not possible to say how far the German Government may have been influenced by the British representations, but several of the reductions conceded affect articles included in these representations; and, although there is at present no commercial treaty between the United Kingdom and Germany, British traders will benefit by these reductions. For example, the duty imposed under the general tariff on the class of files referred to in the Question has been reduced from about 20s. to about 14s. per cwt. It is true that this concession was made in negotiation with Switzerland, but it will apply also to similar files from Sheffield.

Effect of New Russian Tariff on British Medicines.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if the new tariff coming into force to-morrow in All the Russias against British goods increases the duties on the same scale as applied to medicines, namely, from 24 to 40 roubles per pood, the bottles, tins, and paper in which the medicines are packed being included in the weight for duty; and having regard to the effect such increased duties will have upon British trade with Russia, what representations have been made to St. Petersburg on the subject, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The increase in the Russian duty on medicines from 24 to 40 roubles, referred to in the Question, will not be applied to British goods, since the existing rate of 24 roubles has been conceded to France under the new Russo-French Commercial Treaty, and can consequently be claimed by British exporters in virtue of the most-favoured-nation provision of the Anglo-Russian Treaty.

Sale of Goods confiscated by Customs Authorities.

MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that some 5 cwt. of saccharine, of the value of about £700, consigned to a London firm under a false declaration as to its description and landed from an Ostend mail steamer at Dover, was recently seized by the Customs authorities at Dover, taken out into the bay, and poured into the sea; and whether he will consider the advisability of securing that in future goods so seized, instead of being thrown away, should be sold and the proceeds applied to some useful public purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Question appears to refer to four drums containing chemical substances imported at Dover during February, 1905. The goods in question were not smuggled, but were abandoned by the importer apparently because they were found to be liable to the saccharine duty. Owing to chemical action while the goods were in store the tins corroded and unhealthy fumes were given off, and, as the sanitary authorities objected, the goods had to be destroyed. I may add that confiscated goods are periodically sold by auction by the Customs Department, and that no goods are destroyed unless they are worthless or unsaleable.

Regulations for Admission to Training Colleges.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask the President to the Board of Education whether he will consider the advisability of modifying the regulations issued last year relating to the admission of students to a course of study for an university degree in training colleges, so far as such regulations require seven distinctions on the entrance examination in addition to mathematics.

Regulations for Training School Teachers.

MR. SEARS: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will revise the Regulations for Training Teachers, 1905, under which a three-years' student, who having taken an university examination for a degree fails to pass, will be recognised for one year only after the close of his period of training, so far as they provide that at the end of that year such recognition will cease unless he has then passed either the final university examination for a degree or certificate examination of the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Board are receiving representations in regard to these points from the universities, training colleges, and other bodies interested, which are being carefully considered. The Board are not yet in a position to give a definite reply. In the meantime it may be pointed out that the regulations referred to in this Question include mathematics as one of the seven subjects in which distinction must be obtained.

Receipt and Expenditure of the Development Grant (Ireland) Fund.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin, County N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will grant a Return showing the payments into and out of the Development Grant (Ireland) Fund since its institution to the present time, and particularly the balances to the credit of the fund in each financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. It is provided by Section 1 (5) of The Ireland Development Grant Act, 1903, that the Lord-Lieutenant shall, as soon as may be after the close of each financial year, make a Report to Parliament of all his proceedings under the Act. This provision has been duly observed, and the information desired will be found in the Reports. The latest Report, dated 19th May, 1905, is published as House of Commons Paper [Cd. 2539] of that year.

Suggested Introduction of a Seed Supply Bill.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution passed by the Oughterard, county Galway, Board of Guardians requesting the Government to pass a Seed Supply Act, to enable the Galway County Council to make provision in the rate about to be made, for collection of the first instalment for the amount due for the seed potatoes given out last year because of the failure of the potato crop; and, if so, whether the Government will introduce a Bill sufficiently early to meet the difficulty, and thus relieve, to some extent, the already overburdened ratepayers of the Oughterard and other poor unions in the West of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) A resolution to the effect mentioned has been received. It is intended to introduce the Seed Supply Bill at an early date.

Improvement of Kaffir Compounds in South Africa.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that the Kaffirs reside in compounds which consist of limited enclosures surrounded by walls or other fencing, whereas the Chinese have large areas of 2,000 acres or more surrounding the buildings in which they sleep and live, available for their free movement and recreation, it is proposed to improve Kaffirs' enclosures.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Entirely new compounds had to be built for the Chinese. Regulations are to be enforced for improving Kaffir compounds, as the hon. Member will see by reference to page 141 of Cd. 2819. The residence of Kaffirs in the mine areas is not subject to the same stringent conditions as are applied to the Chinese.

Condition of Kaffirs Employed at Kimberley Diamond Mines.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Kaffirs employed in the diamond mines at Kimberley are required to reside, when not at work, in enclosed or fenced-in areas covered with wire netting, and are subject to regulations restricting their individual liberty; and, if so, whether any representations or complaints have been received by His Majesty's Government relative to the conditions of residence, employment, or conduct of such native labourers; and, if so, what action has the Government taken, or proposes to take, with regard to such complaints.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The conditions of employment of Kaffirs in the Kimberley diamond mines are of the nature described, which arise from the special needs of the industry. His Majesty's Government have not received any representations or complaints, but I would point out that the period of contract is usually only three months, after which the Kaffir returns to reside with his wife and family, in the country which his labours have enriched.

Abridged Procedure for Partly Considered Bills.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether in considering the proposed new Rules of Procedure he will suggest, within the terms of reference, that Bills which have passed a Second Reading in one session shall be taken up at that stage for Third Reading next session, provided that the same Government is in office.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) This is one of the important Questions which will doubtless come before, and be considered by, the Select Committee.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Naval Manœuvres.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many vessels of the mercantile marine are likely to be detained in connection with the proposed Naval manœuvres next summer, in which the co-operation of British shipowners has been invited, and for how long; what will be the rate of compensation for detention and the total amount payable; whether compensation will be paid for indirect loss to traders generally arising from the dislocation of business caused by the detention of so many tramp steamers; and has any estimate been formed of the aggregate direct and indirect loss the trade of the country will incur during the course of the experiment.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The number of vessels likely to be detained cannot at present be predicted, as it depends entirely on the number of shipowners who are willing to co-operate in the scheme. The Admiralty aim at securing the co-operation of at least 200 vessels. It is anticipated that no vessel will be delayed for more than sixty hours, the average delay being about forty-eight hours. Compensation will be paid for all losses, direct or indirect, arising out of the agreement, with the exception that no claim for loss of charter owing to delayed arrival will be considered. It is not possible to form any accurate estimate of the aggregate loss to the trade of the country, but all claims upon the Admiralty will be covered by insurance.

The papers dealing with the form of agreement between the Admiralty and the shipowners, and the Admiralty and the insurers, are now before the legal advisers of the Admiralty.

Naval and Marine Officers.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what system of entry and training for officers of the Navy and Marines is to be employed.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The hon. Member will find full information on the subject in the Memorandum on entry and training (Cd. 1385), issued in December, 1902, and in the recent Statement of Admiralty Policy (Cd. 2791).

The Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

MR. BROTHERTON (Wakefield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will lay upon the Table the despatch instructing the Earl of Selborne with regard to the repatriation of Chinese coolies, and state also on what date was this despatch transmitted.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Correspondence on this subject has been and is being conducted by telegraph, and the question has not yet reached the stage in which a final despatch can be written.

Volunteer Forces in the Transvaal.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Transvaal and Orange River Colony will be allowed to raise regiments of Yeomanry, Volunteers, and Militia, as is the case in other self-governing Colonies.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is not proposed in principle to exclude the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony from the fullest powers and rights enjoyed by self-governing colonies possessing responsible government in other parts of the British Empire; but in countries so recently emerged from war all questions concerning armed forces must in the interests of the peace and order of His Majesty's dominions be subject to special treatment for the present.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): Is it proposed to prevent the new Constitutional Government of these colonies exercising the privileges of raising troops like other colonies?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think that Question may be more properly answered in connection with another Question on the Paper.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: You have replied on the question of principle. May I ask what you intend to do in practice?

MR. CHURCHILL: If he will read the Answer I have given the hon. Member will see.

Colonel Davies and the Prime Minister.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to a speech delivered by Colonel Davies, of the Imperial Light Horse, at Johannesburg, on the 27th of January last, in the presence of Lord Selborne, in which he referred to the First Lord of the Treasury and his supporters as "that just and honourable right honourable Gentleman, they could put the name themselves, but it began with C. B., and his satellites, and attributed to them cowardice, scurrility, and falsehood"; whether the High Commissioner made any and what protest against such an attack upon the Prime Minister of this country; and, if not, whether His Majesty's Government will take any action in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has noticed the report of the speech to which the hon. Member refers. It is very natural that persons of excitable character who apprehend that their monetary interests may be prejudicially affected by the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to Chinese labour should express themselves strongly, particularly after dinner. The Secretary of State does not propose to attach undue importance to such criticism, though it is to be regretted that Lord Selborne should have been subjected to the annoyance of hearing it offered in his presence.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Did the High Commissioner make any protest, and, if so, what?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not able to say whether the protests of the High Commissioner took the form of verbal interruption of the proceedings or not.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Was any protest made at all, and has the hon. Gentleman any authority for suggesting that the speech did not meet with the approval of the High Commissioner? Has he had any communication with the High Commissioner?

MR. CHURCHILL: I, of course, assume that the High Commissioner would regard with disapproval any reflections on the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: But has the hon. Gentleman made any communication with the High Commissioner? We regard this as an insult to our Leader.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think it would be proper to attribute to the High Commissioner the best motives in such a matter.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I shall draw attention to this matter on the Estimates.

Orange River Colony Constitution.

MR. BROTHERTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when it is anticipated that the constitution of the Orange River Colony will come into force.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is not possible to fix an approximate date at present; but His Majesty's Government would desire that the grant of responsible institutions to both the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony should be so far as possible simultaneous.

British Indian Subjects in the Transvaal.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if the demands of British Indian subjects in South Africa are to be made the subject of further representation to the self-governing Colonies involved.

MR. CHURCHILL (for Mr. MORLEY): His Majesty's Government will keep constantly in view the interests of British Indians in the self-governing colonies of South Africa, and will neglect no opportunity of endeavouring to secure them a satisfactory *status* which the course of events may suggest. No further representations are, however, at present in contemplation.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what representations have been made with regard to the future of British Indian subjects in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

MR. CHURCHILL (for Mr. MORLEY): No fresh representations have been made recently. The policy of the late Government was set forth in Mr. Lyttelton's despatch of 20th July, 1904, printed in Cd. 2239. His Majesty's Government are considering the subject in view of the early grant of responsible government in the two Colonies.

Indian Government and the Transvaal Labour Ordinance.

MR. HILLS (Durham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India was ever expressly asked to allow its subjects to work in the Transvaal gold mines under the conditions of the Asiatic Labour Ordinance of 1904, and, if so, what answer it gave; and whether the Government of India expressed its willingness to allow Indian coolies to come to the Transvaal and Natal to work exclusively at railway-making under indenture, subject to compulsory repatriation at the end of the indenture.

MR. CHURCHILL (for Mr. MORLEY): The Government of India was never asked to allow its subjects to work in the Transvaal gold mines under the conditions of the Asiatic Labour Ordinance of 1904. The Government of India in January, 1904, was ready to allow labourers to be recruited in India for work on railways in the Transvaal under indentures for two years, to terminate in India, thus securing compulsory repatriation.

Factory Inspection and Religious Institutions.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the practice of His Majesty's Inspectors of Factories and Workshops to inspect regularly the manufacturing and other industrial establishments of religious and philanthropic institutions; and, if not, whether he will give instructions for such inspection to be made.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am advised that the Factory Act does not apply to industries carried on in religious and philanthropic institutions where the relationship of employer and employed does not ordinarily exist, and which are not worked for purposes of private gain. Where factories or workshops in the ordinary sense are carried on in connection with such institutions they are inspected; and in some cases not coming under the Acts where the institutions have been willing to accept inspection.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Is it intended to introduce legislation this session?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have already said I cannot promise legislation this session.

Women Factory Inspectors.

MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he contemplates increasing the number of women factory inspectors.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Answer to this Question is in the affirmative.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): How many inspectors will be added?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not prepared to state at present.

MR. SLOAN: Will there be one for Ireland?

MR. GLADSTONE: The whole matter is under consideration at present.

Metropolitan Police.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will make provision in his Estimates for this year for providing the members of the Metropolitan Police Force with one day's rest in seven.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir; I am sorry that I cannot do so. As stated yesterday in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for South West Ham, the cost of the necessary augmentation to the Force would be so great that it could not be met without exceeding the limit of 9d. in the £ fixed by the Police Rate Act, 1868, to the Metropolitan Police rate.

Police and Public—Case of Mr. Harold Price.

MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Harold Nisbet Price, chartered accountant, who was arrested on Sunday, the 11th February instant, in Canonbury Place, Islington, on a charge of extinguishing a street lamp in Canonbury Square, preferred by P.C. Moore, and P.C. Turner; whether he is aware that Mr. Price was searched and placed in a cell, and remained there until bail could be obtained and his release effected, that Mr. Price was discharged the next morning by Mr. Bros, the stipendary magistrate, who said that the case really involved a question of perjury; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be instituted into the conduct of the police in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: Mr. Harold Nisbet Price was arrested by the police on the 11th of February on the charge of having extinguished a street lamp, and was brought to the station where he was detained in a cell until bail was given. He was not searched but was invited to deliver up any matches or knife he had in his possession, and he did so. As regards the question of perjury, I find from the report of the proceedings that Mr. Bros, the magistrate, asked the solicitor for the defendant whether he imputed perjury, and that the solicitor said he did not, but he considered that the police had made a mistake. Careful inquiry has been made by the Commissioner into the facts, and he reports to me that he finds no reason for blaming the police officers concerned, except that he thinks that the officer in charge of the station might, in the exercise of his discretion, have released Mr. Price on his own recognisance instead of requiring bail.

Match Box Industry.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether in Order 81, extending the homework sections, now lying on the Table for forty days, the term paper boxes excludes match boxes as being chiefly made of wood: and whether there is any reason against extending the Order to these or making a new Order to include them.

MR. GLADSTONE: Match boxes made of card would be within the Order, but match-boxes chiefly made of wood would not come within the terms of the Order. Inquiries with regard to several small industries, of which match-box making is one, are now in progress, and I think it will be best to wait for their completion before amending the new Order which has only recently been made and issued to local authorities.

Meals to School Children—Parents' Liability.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to a recent trial in the county court, held at Bradford, where His Honour Judge Bompas gave a verdict against forty-nine parents for repayment of costs for meals supplied by the guardians of the poor, under the Child-feeding Order of the Local Government Board, in respect to which he refused to hear evidence as to the means of the parents; and will he say if he proposes to take any, and, if any, what action in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have communicated with the Judge about this case, and I will inform the hon. Member when a reply is received; but I have no authority to take any other action in the matter.

Medical and Dental Acts.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intends to introduce any Bill to amend the Medical and Dental Acts, in accordance with the proposals of the British Medical and Dental Associations.

MR. GLADSTONE: My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I fear that I cannot make any statement as to legislation by the Government on this subject. I understand that the British Medical Association have a Bill in draft, and they will, perhaps, entrust it to a private Member.

Wales and the Proposed Canal Commission.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if, in view of the importance of an improved waterway system for the distribution in the Midlands of goods imported into South Wales ports, and the attention that has been given to the subject by the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce, he will consider the advisability of recommending the appointment of a South Wales representative on the proposed Canal Commission.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The list of proposed members for this Commission has now been made up. I believe my hon. friend will find that all interests concerned are fairly represented.

Emigration Returns.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if in future returns he will cause the number of Welsh emigrants and immigrants from and to the United Kingdom to be stated separately, as is now done in the case of those of Scotch and Irish nationality.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The particulars with respect to nationality of emigrants and immigrants which the Board of Trade are empowered to obtain are defined in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894. My legal advisers are of opinion that no distinction could be made between English and Welsh passengers without fresh legislation. I will see that a clause to remedy this defect is inserted in the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act to be introduced shortly by the Government.

Public Works—House Accommodation for Workmen.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the advisability of framing a Standing Order making it compulsory upon the promoters of Bills for public works (such as canals, docks, railways, &c.) to make provision for suitable and sanitary house accommodation for the workmen and their families who may be engaged upon the construction of such works.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am afraid that my department have no power to alter the Standing Orders referred to, and would suggest that the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent puts his Question to the hon. Member for Oldham, the Chairman of Committees, who alone can deal with it.

Weight of Post Parcels.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, considering that for the smallest excess over 11 lbs. in weight the Post Office officials are entitled to refuse to take in a parcel, he will recommend an increase in the maximum weight of parcels from eleven to fourteen pounds, at the same rate as at present in force.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The question of increasing the maximum weight allowed for a parcel has been considered on more than one occasion. but there are many difficulties in the way, and I regret that I cannot comply with the hon. Member's wishes in the matter.

Agricultural Rates Act, 1896.

*LORD HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, inasmuch as the annual grant received by various unions is now insufficient to cover the relief intended to be granted to agricultural land under the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, he will take steps to again ascertain and certify the amount which should at the present time be paid to the Local Taxation Account for distribution annually amongst each spending authority.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Section 4 of the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, requires that the annual grant paid under that Act to the Local Taxation Account and the share of the grant paid annually to each spending authority, shall be based on the amount of the rates raised during the year 1895–6, and the Act gives the Local Government Board no authority to certify as the amount of the grant a sum based on the figures of any later year.

Bradford School Children's Meals.

MR. JOWETT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Bradford Board of Guardians are making a charge of 3d. each for school meals supplied by them under the Board's Child-feeding Order, and that they are enforcing this charge against parents whose incomes is insufficient to provide ½d. meals for the children who are not in receipt of school meals; whether he is also aware that one parent threatened with a summons for payment of the 3d. each for meals has since buried one of his children that had died by reason of insufficient feeding through poverty; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have not received any representations as regards this matter, but I will communicate with the guardians with respect to it.

English Hop Crop Returns.

MR. COURTHORPE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture whether steps will be taken to obtain actual instead of estimated Returns of the English hop crop.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): The suggestion of the hon. Member is one which has often been considered, but the difficulties in the way of obtaining accurate Returns of the actual produce of crops from every individual grower are obviously considerable, and legislation would be required in order to make the delivery of such returns compulsory. We shall, however, be glad to look further into the matter in detail, and if the hon. Member would like to have an opportunity of conferring personally with the officers of the Board on the subject, I shall be very happy to make arrangements accordingly. We are naturally anxious that the Returns should be compiled with the greatest possible accuracy.

Railway Companies and the Highland Society's Show.

Lord DALMENY (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that, while the Caledonian Railway Company is offering cheap railway facilities in connection with the Highland Society's show, to be held in Peeblesshire this year, the North British Railway Company decline to grant similar facilities; and, if so, whether the Board of Agriculture will make representations to the North British Railway Company in order that the success of the show may not be imperilled.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: I am aware that certain difficulties have arisen in connection with the matter to which my noble friend refers, but we have not as yet received any representations from the Highland and Agricultural Society respecting it. I feel sure that if the directors of the Society should consider that we can be of any service to them in this or any other direction they will not hesitate to approach us on the subject.

Government Education Policy.

Mr. FINCH (Rutland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if it is proposed to repeal the Education Authorities Default Act before amending the Education Acts of 1902 and 1903.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): I am not yet in a position to make any statement upon the education policy of the Government.

Education Returns.

Mr. WYNDHAM (Dover): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Return of the schools recognised on the 1st day of January, 1906, as non-provided public elementary schools ordered by the House of Commons, will contain all the information asked for in the Return for which a notice of Motion stands on to-day's Paper; and whether he will state when the Return, already ordered, may be expected.

The notice of Motion was as follows:—

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (Non-provided Schools) (No. 2)—Return of Non-provided Elementary Schools (1) which are the property of private individuals with managers appointed under the provisions of the Education Act of 1902; (2) which are held under trusts requiring such schools to be in union with, and to be conducted upon, the religious principles of any religious denomination; (3) which are held under trusts not requiring any particular form of religious instruction, but which have been conducted by members of a particular religious denomination; and (4) which are held under trusts not requiring any particular form of religious instruction, and which have not been conducted by members of a particular religious denomination.

Mr. BIRRELL: I think that the Return which the Board of Education are now preparing, will comprise all the information asked for in the Return proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, so far as it could accurately be given. I should perhaps add that as regards his first category, we shall state the schools which are claimed as private property, without at the present stage undertaking to verify such claims; and as regards his third and fourth categories, we shall have as full regard as possible, in framing the Return, to the usage which has prevailed in such schools, without seeking to verify the actual conduct of the school by a given denomination. I am unable to state definitely by what date the Return will be completed. This will depend in large measure upon the promptitude with which the Trust Deeds and the other replies to the Board's questions, now being sent out to every school, are sent in. But every step will be taken to complete and publish the Return as expeditiously as possible.

Land Rent Disparities.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the disparity between rents fixed by different sub-commission courts, and especially between rents fixed before and since 1903; why the judicial rents fixed now do not bear the same relation to current prices of produce and of labour that rents fixed sixteen years ago bore to the prices of that time; why some sub-commissioners do, while others do not, fix rents on the tenant's improvements and occupation interest; and if he will take any steps to bring about approximate uniformity of view and of decision on a given set of facts.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The Land Commission inform me that they are not aware of any disparity between the rents fixed by different sub-commission Courts, nor between rents fixed before and since 1903, nor that the rents fixed now do not bear the same relation to current prices of produce and labour that rents fixed sixteen years ago did to the prices of that time. They further state that it is not the case, as alleged, that sub-commissioners fix rents upon the tenant's improvements. It was judicially decided some years ago that, in fixing a fair rent upon a holding, the holding is not to be valued as if in the landlord's hands available for letting to an incoming tenant, and that, on the other hand, no deduction is to be made by reason of the tenant's occupation interest, beyond his interest in the improvements on the holding. The Land Commission believe that the assistant commissioners loyally observe this decision. The Land Commission also believe that under the present system of fixing fair rents, and especially considering the right of appeal which exists, approximate uniformity of view and decision has been obtained.

Irish Judicial Rents.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the opinion prevalent in Ireland that the judicial rents fixed since the enactment of the Land Act of 1903 have been fixed regardless of the tenants' occupation interest, regardless of depreciation in quality and price of produce, and regardless of the increased cost of labour, and that this has been done for the purpose of discouraging recourse to the courts and forcing embarrassed tenants to purchase at exorbitant prices; whether he will institute an inquiry into the grounds for this opinion, and as part of such inquiry have the Harlech property in Westmeath, on which rents have recently been fixed, again inspected by four practical farmers, impartially chosen; and whether he will find a remedy, legislative or administrative, for any injustice disclosed by the inquiry.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that they are aware of no such opinion as is mentioned in the Question, beyond the opinions perhaps natural and unavoidable, prevalent among litigants who have been disappointed at the results of the proceedings they have taken. Such dissatisfaction may exist both among tenants and landlords. The Land Commission add that it is not the case as stated, that since the Act of 1903, judicial rents have been fixed regardless of the present quality and price of produce, and of the cost of labour. The Lay Assistant Commissioners and Assessors have knowledge and experience of all such matters, and the Courts which fix judicial rents carefully consider the evidence upon these points which is frequently produced. It has been judicially decided that no deduction is to be made on account of the tenant's occupation interest beyond his interest in the improvements in his holding. In the case of the Harlech Estate I am informed that out of seventeen cases in which judicial rents have been fixed during the past two years, an appeal was taken in one case only, and in that case the decision of the Sub-Commission was confirmed. Parliament has placed the determination of rents in the hands of the Land Commission, and I am not aware that, even if I have power to direct the enquiry suggested, grounds justifying such a step have been shown to exist.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) asked for a return showing the percentages of reduction before and after 1903.

MR. BRYCE required notice of the Question.

Irish Fisheries—Close Season.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state if the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries have power to hold inquiries with a view to changing the close seasons; and, if not, what is the cause of their inability.

MR. BRYCE: The powers for holding such inquiries are now vested in the Department of Agriculture. The 33rd Section of the Act 5–6 Vic. cap. 106 enacts that "the expenses of the application and all proceedings consequent thereon shall be defrayed by the person or persons who shall have signed such application." For over forty years inquiries relative to the change of close season were held without enforcing this proviso. In the year 1895, however, objection to this practice was raised in Parliament; and, as there is no way of estimating or assessing the expenses, the holding of such inquiries has since been suspended pending an alteration in the law.

MR. BOLAND: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further.

MR. BRYCE: It is a question of finding time to alter the law.

Lord Dunraven's Limerick Estates.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, can he say whether Lord Dunraven has sold his estates around Adare and Croom, county Limerick, to the tenants on it; and, if so whether the sale has been carried out directly between the landlord and the tenants, or through the Estates Commissioners; and what were the terms as to the number of years' purchase on the various classes of tenancy. whether on first term or second term rents.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners are negotiating with Lord Dunraven for the purchase of his estates, comprising about 11,694 acres, in the district referred to; but, until those negotiations have concluded, it is obviously undesirable to state the proposed terms of purchase.

Evicted Tenants of the Dunraven Estates.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that Lord Dunraven had, and still has, some evicted tenants on his property south and west of Adare, County Limerick; that John Ryan, of Farringstown, has been evicted for many years by Lord Dunraven from his farm in Baybush, and has not yet been reinstated; and that the farm of John Ryan at Baybush has been taken up by a tenant convenient; and can he say whether there is any immediate prospect of John Ryan getting back to his farm through the Estates Commissioners or otherwise.

MR. BRYCE: The cases of John Ryan, and of several other evicted tenants on Lord Dunraven's estate, are under the consideration of the Estates Commissioners, who are negotiating for the purchase of the estate.

Second Term Rents in Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sub-Commissioners Tuckey and Baggot, on the application of Mrs. Morrin, Brittas, Queen's County, to fix a second-term rent, recently heard before them at Maryborough, raised the first-term rent of £20 to £22 6s., the landlord valuer's estimate of the fair rent being £20, and that of the valuer for the tenant £16 10s.; and whether he can state on what basis those officials acted in raising the rent £2 6s. over the estimate of the landlord's valuer.

MR. BRYCE: It is the fact that a Sub-Commission Court, presided over by Mr. Tuckey, Legal Assistant Commissioner, raised the fair rent in this case from £20, the amount of the first term rent, to £22 6s. I am informed by the Land Commission that the case was heard and decided in the ordinary way, each party being legally represented and producing evidence at the hearing. The decisions of Sub-Commissions are judicial decisions subject to appeal, and in this case an appeal was taken with the result that the rent for the second term was fixed at £20, the amount of the first term rent, instead of £22 6s., the amount fixed by the Sub-Commission.

MR. DELANY: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last paragraph of the Question?

MR. BRYCE: I can say nothing as to the motives of the Commissioners.

Sligo Council Printing Contract.

Mr. LIDDELL (Down, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the county council of Sligo gave a contract for printing to Mr. P. A. McHugh on the ground that he had suffered for the Nationalist cause, although his tender was £429 above that of Mr. Kilgallon; that when Mr. Kilgallon, on its being proposed that his tender should be accepted, advanced to pay the necessary fee, one of the councillors seized him by the shoulders, snatched the money out of his hands, and threatened to throw him downstairs; and whether the Local Government Board will take steps to protect the ratepayers of Sligo from the imposition of unnecessary expenditure for political reasons.

Mr. BRYCE: On August 26th, 1905, the Sligo County Council considered tenders for their printing contract for three years. Nine persons tendered, amongst them being Mrs. Kate McHugh at £399 a year, and Mr. T. Kilgallon at £250 a year. Before considering the tenders, the Council passed a resolution that the printing should be done in County Sligo; and the Council thereupon accepted Mrs. McHugh's tender on the ground that the only lower tender was that of Mr. Kilgallon, whose plant was insufficient to carry out the contract satisfactorily. The Local Government Board have no information as to the alleged ill-treatment of Mr. Kilgallon at the meeting. The question of the legality of the payment will be considered by the auditor of the Local Government Board in due course.

*Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): Is it the fact that the contract was given to Mr. McHugh because he had suffered in the Nationalist cause.

Mr. BRYCE: I really have no information and I am surprised the hon. Member should think I could tell him what passes in committee of the Sligo County Council.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Is it not the fact that Mr. Kilgallon is a bankrupt and therefore ineligible?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman obtain an answer to the question as to the reason for giving Mr. McHugh the contract?

Mr. BRYCE: If it is wished that time should be occupied by questions of that sort I will obtain the information.

Compensation Claim at Limerick Quarter Sessions.

*Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that at Limerick quarter sessions £10 compensation was awarded to John Bowman, of Movine, Ardpatrick, for the malicious cutting off of the tails of two milch cows on the 22nd November; and whether any attempt was made to discover and punish the perpetrators of this crime.

Mr. BRYCE: The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question, save that the amount of the compensation awarded was £7 7s. The evidence of malice given at the hearing was that Bowman was not on friendly terms with certain of his neighbours, owing to disputes about trespass; and it did not appear that the case had any agrarian significance. The police made diligent inquiries into the matter, but did not succeed in discovering the offender.

Blake Estate, County Galway.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have had communicated to them a resolution, passed on 28th November last, by tenants of Brackloonbeg, on the Blake Estate, Benmore, county Galway, refusing to pay any rent until such times as the Board would let them know the terms of sale for their agricultural holdings; and what action was taken by the Board in consequence of such resolution.

Mr. BRYCE: The resolution referred to was received by the Congested Districts Board, who informed the tenants' solicitor that the Board were prepared to enlarge the small holdings on the estate in question as soon as the estate became legally vested in them, but that they had no power to divide and sell the lands purchased until the estate should be so vested in them. The Board added that if the tenants did not pay their rents forthwith, legal proceedings would be instituted against them; and, accordingly, proceedings are now being taken against the defaulters for the payment of one year's rent.

Drogheda Compensation Claim.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that John Elliott, tenant on Lord Massereene's estate at Monasterboice, was awarded £10 compensation at Drogheda quarter sessions, on 4th January last, for the malicious burning of hay; and that the claimant declared on oath that, in common with the other planters on the estate, he was under police protection, and none of his neighbours would speak to him; and whether the police obtained any clue to the incendiary.

Mr. BRYCE: The facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. The police authorities inform me that they have no information as to whether the tenant declared that he, in common with other planters, was under police protection, and that none of his neighbours would speak to him. The fact, however, is, that for a considerable time past, the new tenants on this estate have been generally free from interference, with the result that it has been found possible to considerably reduce the police protection afforded to them. The police failed to obtain any clue to the incendiary in this case.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): For the information of the new Members, will the right hon. Gentleman give a definition of the word "planter."

Mr. BRYCE: The hon. Member had better put down a separate Question.

Athenry Outrage.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether it was reported to the police that on 26th December, 1905, the house of Martin Fahey at Killescragh, near Athenry, was fired into and windows smashed; (2) whether Fahey holds a small farm on the Benmore estate, which has been purchased by the Congested Districts Board; (3) and whether the cause assigned for the incident was the fact that he was suspected of paying his rent, contrary to the wishes of other tenants; (4) and what action has been taken in the matter.

Mr. BRYCE: The facts are as stated in the first two sections of this Question. The police have done, and are doing, everything that may be possible to discover the offenders, and protection is being afforded to Fahey.

South Tyrone Election.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that since the recent election in South Tyrone, Protestants who refused to vote for the candidate supported by the Nationalist convention have complained of annoyance and intimidation, and that an attack was made upon one, Robert Dornion of Clogher, on the 9th February; and what steps are being taken to protect the lives and property of people in this district.

Mr. BRYCE: Complaints of the nature referred to have been received, not only in South Tyrone, but also in other constituencies. The annoyance complained of does not appear to have been confined to one Party, but has been indulged in on both sides during the excitement of contested elections. The particular case referred to appears to be that in which three men have been returned for trial at assizes for an assault upon Richard Durneen. The police are using every effort to preserve the peace, and I am informed that the excitement consequent on the elections is fast dying out.

A Question of Order.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT, having postponed a Question addressed to the Chief Secretary as to the alleged intimidation to which the grand jurors at the last Galway summer assizes were subjected.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) rose to a point of order. He said that the hon. Member's Question had been on the Paper for several days in a different form from that in which it now appeared. Originally it contained a specific charge of the gravest character against a Member of the House, who was mentioned by name.

Now that charge had been struck out of the Question. He wished to know who was responsible for allowing the Order Paper to be made a medium for circulating a gross libel on an hon. Member; and whether it was in order to refer to an hon. Member by name even in a Question.

*MR. SPEAKER: In this case, as soon as my attention was called to the imputation contained in the Question, I had the words struck out. I am asked who is responsible for circulating the Question in that form. The hon. Member who puts the Question in that form is responsible. The clerks at the Table exercise all the vigilance they can, but sometimes irregularities escape their notice. As soon as my attention is called to the fact, I take steps to have a correction made.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I hope that a gross case of this kind will not be allowed to occur again.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked whether there was any case in which a Member of the House had been named in a Question.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have seen sometimes the names of hon. Members given and sometimes their constituencies. I think for the future it would be better if hon. Members are referred to in Questions that the reference should be the same as in debates.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Would it be in order for me to ask the Chief Secretary to answer this Question? It was a scandalous thing to put a Question of this sort on the Paper, leave it there for nearly a week, and then postpone it.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: May I explain that I was asked to postpone the Question for a few days?

MR. BRYCE: I do not think the information in my possession is sufficient to enable me to answer the Question completely.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): May I ask whether the ruling of the Speaker is that if any Member of the House is concerned in any proceedings which are contrary to the law no Question can be asked in the House with regard to him, although it might be asked with regard to other persons who have participated in those proceedings?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not go so far as that. An imputation was cast upon an hon. Member in this case, but there was no direct charge. The Question, so far as I remember, suggested that it was in consequence of something which had been said by an hon. Member that certain other things took place. It was an implied charge, not a direct one. If there were any case of a direct charge against an hon. Member it would be desirable to direct the attention of the House specifically to it.

Irish Rent Appeals.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the appeal case of Lucy Morrin, tenant, *v.* Thomas Kemmis, landlord, heard in Dublin last month, the second-term rent fixed by Sub-Commissioners Tuckey and Baggot was reduced from £22 6s. to £20; that the sub-commissioners referred to fixed the second-term rent in this case £2 6s. over the landlord valuer's estimate of a fair rent in the court below, and that the same valuer for the landlord declared upon oath before the appeal court that the rent fixed by the Sub-Commission was in excess of value; whether he will state what locality Messrs. Tuckey and Baggot are operating in at present; when their term of employment expires; and whether it is proposed to continue their services.

MR. BRYCE: I have already replied to the earlier part of that Question in my answer to the hon. Member's Question No. 36.† I am informed that Mr. Tuckey is a permanent assistant Legal Commissioner, and that Mr. Baggot is a temporary Lay Commissioner, whose present term will shortly expire. I have no information as to where these gentlemen are at present employed. The Land Commission inform me that Messrs. Tuckey and Baggot are gentlemen in whose impartiality and ability they have every confidence. They add that on questions of value opinions frequently differ; and the appeal court at times considers it right to raise the rents fixed by the Sub-Commission Courts.

---

† See page 1138.

Wexford Jury and Voters Lists.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a recent meeting the Wexford County Council passed a resolution to the effect that the expenses of the annual preparation of the jurors' and voters' lists was excessive, amounting in the county to £1,100, and that the part of this work done by clerks of unions, and the emoluments connected therewith, supposed to be from £500 to £600 would eventually fall in to the secretary of the county council; and that, as this expenditure comes altogether out of the local rates, they request the Government to have the law altered so that when the work falls into the county council office the county council may be entited to fix the remuneration instead of, as at present, having it fixed by statutory fees; and whether he can promise legislation in the direction indicated in the resolution.

Mr. BRYCE: I understand that the Wexford County Council have passed a resolution to the effect stated. The expenses of the preparation of jurors' lists are regulated by rules fixed by orders in Council. The remuneration and expenses of officers engaged in the preparation of the franchise lists are paid in accordance with the scale made by the Local Government Board under the Parliamentary Registration Expense Act, 1890. It must be borne in mind that a large proportion of the fees received by secretaries of county councils is paid to their assistants. The Local Government Board have not been made aware that there is any general desire on the part of local authorities to have the existing practice altered.

Newman Estate, Mallow, County Cork.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received any recent information in respect to the Newman Estate, Dromore, Mallow, County Cork, and the tenant, Timothy C. O'Callaghan, who was excluded from the operation of the purchase scheme, though an ordinary tenant willing to purchase on the same terms as other tenants; are the Commissioners aware that this tenant has since been evicted, and he and his son imprisoned for one month in connection with the eviction proceedings; and, under these circumstances, and having regard to the fact that the holding is vacant, will the Commissioners take steps to provide for the purchase of the farm and the reinstatement of the evicted tenant.

Mr. BRYCE: I understand that the facts are as stated in the second paragraph of the Question. The Estates Commissioners inform me that it has only now come to their knowledge that an eviction has taken place in this case, and that they will make further inquiries into the matter.

Tobacco Growing in Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can say whether the request of those interested in tobacco-growing in Ireland for an extension of the time during which a rebate shall be given on Irish grown tobacco can be granted.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): The concession made by the Treasury granting a rebate of one-third of the duty on tobacco grown in Ireland was for a period of five years from the 1st December 1903. I shall be glad to receive from the hon. Gentleman or those interested in the experiment any suggestions as to the necessity for further extention of time.

Football in Phœnix Park, Dublin.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N,): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that of the thirty-one grounds allotted for the games of football and hurling in the Phœnix Park, Dublin, only two are allotted to the members of the Gaelic Athletic Association, while the remaining grounds are given up to the use of the clubs which follow Association rules, he will say what is the reason for this attempt at boycotting Irish games by the Board of Works in Dublin; and whether the Board will be directed to make a more equitable distribution of the amusements grounds in the Phœnix Park between the Gaelic Athletic Association clubs and the other clubs mentioned.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): There are thirty-one football grounds in the Phœnix Park and one separate ground for hurling. Of the football grounds twenty nine are allotted for Association football and two for Gaelic football. In making this allotment regard is had to the respective number of players of the two games. From 1st September, 1905, when the football season opened, to the 14th ultimo the number of applications received from Association clubs was 1,784, an average in round numbers of sixty per ground. During the same period the number of applications from Gaelic clubs was twenty-six, an average of thirteen per ground.

Basis Wines.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will insert in his Revenue Bill the proposal which was dropped last year for imposing a tax on the manufacturers of the alcoholic beverages known as basis wines, in view of their competition with imported wines, due to the fact that they do not contribute to the revenue.

MR. ASQUITH: The proposal was to impose a licence Duty with a view to bringing the manufacture of British wines under excise supervision not to put a tax on the product itself. The matter is receiving my careful consideration, and I will make a statement at a later date.

MR. LEA: Might I point out that one of the effects of the absence of a tax on these beverages has been a loss of confidence on the part of the wine-consuming public, who for years past have had stuff manufactured in London foisted on them as the produce of the Gironde and Côte d'Or.

MR. ASQUITH: I know that is the suggestion.

Old Age Pensions.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he could inform the House of the number of persons approximately over sixty-five years who are in want of poverty who would be likely to apply for a pension of 5s. a week; and also an estimate of the saving that might be effected in poor rates were such a pension granted to the poor.

MR. ASQUITH: This is a matter of mere speculation. It will be remembered that the proposals made by a Select Committee of this House about the aged deserving poor, which excluded on specific grounds a number of persons from the pension list, were referred to a Departmental Committee to examine from a financial point of view. After allowing for the exclusions specified in the Committee's terms of reference, they estimated the cost of the scheme at £10,300,000 in 1901, and £12,650,000 in 1911. The present cost on this basis would probably not be far short of £11,500,000.

Coolie Labour in British Guiana.

MR. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if a grant from the Exchequer will be proposed to enable indentured coolies employed in British Guiana to be repatriated, if dissatisfied with their conditions.

MR. ASQUITH (For Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN): No Sir. The considerations which have influenced His Majesty's Government in dealing with the question of repatriation in South Africa do not apply in the case of coolies in British Guiana.

Franchise Reform

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in bringing in a Bill for the prevention of plurality in voting, he will favourably consider the introduction of a clause in that Bill providing that where three or more candidates stand for the same constituency in a Parliamentary election, and where the candidate securing most votes has obtained less than 50 per cent. of the total votes recorded, there should forthwith be a second election in which the two candidates alone should stand who have secured most votes in the first election, with a view to securing better representation of the country in this House.

MR. ASQUITH (for Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN): The subject named by my hon. friend, although deserving consideration, is not relevant to the question of plural voting, and will therefore not be dealt with in the Bill to which he refers.

Prevention of Chinese Immigration into the United Kingdom.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to take steps to prevent any systematic immigration of Chinese labour into the United Kingdom on the occasion of its completion of its contracts in South Africa.

MR. ASQUITH (for Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN): Any systematic immigration into the United Kingdom does not at present seem probable. If, however, the contingency were to arise, it would be for His Majesty's Government to consider whether any steps should be taken to check it.

SIR H. VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked whether this matter was not provided for by the Aliens Act of last session.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think it is.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POSTPONEMENT OF THE FISCAL DEBATE.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he wished to make a request which he was afraid would be a matter of some inconvenience to the Government; this was, however, unavoidable. The House was aware, and would share his regret at the illness of the Leader of the Opposition—[Cries of "Which one?"]—the Leader of the Opposition. He was sorry to say he was informed that there was no chance of his right hon. friend being there before Monday at the earliest, and he could not be certain that he would be present on that day. He regretted to say that his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham was also laid up with an attack of influenza, and it was impossible that he should be there to-morrow. He thought the debate on the Motion of the hon. Member for the Colne Valley † would—obviously from their point of view—be very incomplete without the presence of those two right hon. Gentlemen, and he gathered, from observations made at an earlier stage this session by the Prime Minister, that their absence would be equally regretted by the Front Bench opposite. Under these circumstances he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be good enough to postpone that Motion, he would suggest, till to-morrow week, and, if he could comply with that request, whether he could say what business would be taken to-morrow.

MR. ASQUITH said that he was sure the House heard with very great regret the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. They all felt, as he said, that from his point of view, and he would say from their point of view on that Bench, the debate on the fiscal question would be very incomplete in the absence of both right hon. Gentlemen representing the Opposition—in the absence not only of the Prince of Denmark, but of the ghost. He would not presume to allocate these parts as between the two right hon. Gentlemen themselves. He did not, therefore, feel under the circumstances in a position to deny the request which the right hon. Gentleman had made. At the same time, as the House would appreciate, it placed the Government in a position of very considerable embarrassment, because the whole of their arrangements for business had been made on the footing that to-morrow would be devoted to this question, a question which they thought right should be submitted to the House at the earliest possible moment. In assenting to the right hon. Gentleman's request he must ask the House to choose between one or two alternative courses for to-morrow, both of which would be attended with a certain amount of inconvenience. They could to-morrow take the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair on going into Committee of Supply on Navy Estimates. The House would understand that those Estimates could not be circulated till to-night, and would not be in the hands of hon. Gentlemen till to-morrow morning. Or they could take the necessary Vote on account for the Civil Services, but that again could not be circulated till to-morrow morning. It would be in the Vote Office at the meeting of the House and would be then accessible to Members. The Government was completely in the hands of the House in the matter, and would be prepared to adopt whichever of those courses was held to be the least inconvenient. He assured hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Government were divested of responsibility in the matter, which was entirely due to the most regrettable necessity which had upset previous arrangements.

---

† SIR JAMES KITSON—Free Trade: That this House, recognising that in the recent General Election the people of the United Kingdom have demonstrated their unqualified fidelity to the principles and practice of free trade, deems it right to record its determination to resist any proposal, whether by way of taxation upon foreign corn or of the creation of a general tariff upon foreign goods, to create in this country a system of protection.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that perhaps the arrangement as to which business should be taken to-morrow could be most advantageously settled by communications among all those interested through the usual channels. He was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the way in which he had met his request.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) submitted that to-morrow would be an opportune moment to lay the whole question of old-age pensions before the House, as to take the business suggested would be embarrassing.

Mr. ASQUITH: It is not on the Paper.

NEW BILLS.

PHARMACY BILL.

To provide for the further regulation of the sale of poisons and the compounding of medical prescriptions, and to amend the Pharmacy Acts 1852 and 1868, presented by Mr. Winfrey; supported by Mr. Idris, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Mr. James Gibb, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Gulland and Mr. O'Malley; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 14th March, and to be printed. [Bill 59.]

INTOXICATING LIQUORS LOCAL VETO (IRELAND) BILL.

"To enable the local government electors of any locality to veto the issue of licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland," presented by Mr. William Redmond; supported by Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Glendinning, Mr. Boland, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Smyth, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, and Sir Thomas Esmonde; to be read a second time upon Friday 6th April, and to be printed. [Bill 60.]

LICENSED PREMISES (ELECTION DAYS) CLOSING BILL.

"To secure the closing of Licensed Premises on certain Election Days," presented by Mr. Charles Roberts; supported by Mr. Billson, Colonel Herbert, Mr. T. W. Russell, Major Renton. Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Whitwell Wilson, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, 18th May, and to be printed. [Bill 61.]

LABOUR PENSIONS BILL.

"To provide pensions for the aged and deserving poor without disfranchisement," presented by Mr. Archibald Grove; to be read a second time upon Wednesday 14th March, and to be printed. [Bill 62.]

SALE OF WHISKY BILL.

"To amend the law relating to the Sale of Whisky, and to provide for the marking of casks and other vessels containing Whisky," presented by Mr. Archibald Williamson; supported by Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Billson. and Mr. Harmood-Banner; to be read a second time upon Wednesday 21st March, and to be printed. [Bill 63.]

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (CHILDREN) BILL).

"To amend the law relating to the Trial and Detention of Children," presented by Mr. John Tennant supported by Lord Edmund Talbot, Sir Howard Vincent, Sir George Kekewich, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Allen, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. Spicer and Mr. J. R. Macdonald, to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 64.]

REFORM OF PROCEDURE—APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fife E.) rose to move the Resolution on the Paper in the name of the Prime Minister, *i.e.* :— "That a Select Committee, be appointed to consider the question of procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the Amendment of the existing rules and upon any new rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business." He said: The terms of this Motion are identical with those which were considered and carried by the House twenty years ago at the instance of Sir M. Hicks-Beach. That, I think, was the last occasion on which a representative and authoritative Committee of the House sat to discuss the general question of their procedure. One of the complaints, I remember, which we made when in opposition some two or three years ago, when the right hon. Gentleman who now leads the Opposition proposed from this Bench the large changes in the rules which now govern our procedure, was that the matter had not first been submitted according to precedent, and I think also according to convenience, to a Committee representing all sections and quarters of the House. Although I do not deny that in some respects those rules have introduced Amendments into our procedure, yet I think that on the whole our experience of them has justified the attitude which we then took up. I feel I am not going beyond what I am sure will be agreed to by the majority of the old Members of the House, and almost all the new Members when I say that, as regards such important matters as the hours of sitting and the time of adjournment the new procedure has been and is productive of the maximum of inconvenience. There are, of course, many other matters, some of them changes introduced by those rules, some of them parts of the old practice of the House, which, in view of the altered conditions in which we are now met, seem to deserve reconsideration and redecision. I do not want to go into any detail, but I wish clearly to indicate to the House what is the course proposed by the Government. We propose to appoint a strong and representative Select Committee, and when that Committee opens its investigations we suggest that they shall not take the form of a fishing or roving inquiry over the whole grounds of procedure, but that the Government shall submit to the Committee, as they will be prepared to do, a definite scheme of their own for consideration, examination, and report. The result of that, I hope, will be that there will be very little loss of time, and that the Committee will be able to pronounce its opinion, aye or no, on definite and particular proposals in regard to such urgent matters—I only mention one or two by way of illustration—as the hours of sitting and adjournment, the larger extension and more convenient application of devolution of certain classes of business to Committee, and the setting up of some machinery satisfactory to the House to avoid the necessity of harsh and summary applications of the rule of closure—what used to be called the guillotine—some satisfactory machinery which will, in the general confidence of the House, provide for the allocation of time as between different classes of measures, and different parts of the same measure. These are only some of the questions which the Government regard as of the most urgent and paramount importance. It is by no means an exhaustive enumeration of the matters to go before the Committee. If the House agrees to my Motion, as I hope it will, I trust that the Committee will be able to get to work almost at once, and that, by sitting three days a week, it may come to an end of its labours before Easter. On points on which there is exceptional urgency, I think they might exercise the power which I believe is inherent in every Committee, of presenting Reports from time to time dealing with the particular matter, and of not waiting until they can make one final Report before making any suggestions. I do not think I need say anything more in support of this Motion, because I do not expect it will be opposed in any part of the House, and I think the House will agree that the sooner the Committee gets to work, and the more quickly it reports, the more prospect we in this House will have of doing our business in a business-like fashion, worthy of the traditions of this great Assembly and of dealing with the ever-increasing mass of work that devolves upon it.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Question of Procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the amendment of the existing Rules and upon any new Rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): So far from desiring to offer any opposition to the Motion for a Committee of Inquiry into our procedure I heartily welcome it. Successive Governments have from time to time attempted so to modify the procedure of this House as to conduce to the most efficient conduct of its business. No one who has any experience of the House will hold that we have reached perfection. I am quite sure that there is room for a great deal of further improvement, and I am glad the matter is to be referred to a Committee for investigation and report. Even amongst those with whom I commonly act there is a good deal of difference of opinion in regard to some of the latest reforms in procedure. Some of my friends do not hold the same views as I do as to what times of sittings and what adjournments are most conductive either to the despatch of business or to the convenience of individual Members. I hope in any changes that are made there will be an endeavour to provide not merely for the efficient discharge of its duties by the House, but—what I believe is essential for that discharge—for the convenience of hon. Members who, while giving, and are ready to give, a large measure of their services to their country and to the House, have other occupations which take up part of their time, and who cannot, like myself, be at the service of the House at any time and for any length of time. As regards the methods of procedure which the right hon. Gentleman has foreshadowed, I assume that the fact that the Government have a scheme cut and dried which they are going to submit to this Committee will not be used in any way to prevent the Committee considering any other suggestions which may be laid before them. We are at one in feeling that the procedure of the House should be the result of a consensus of opinion in the House, and not in any sense the mere expression of the views of a section. I venture to hope that as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has this scheme cut and dried he will communicate to the House the main principles and outline of what it is the Government contemplate. If they had said they merely proposed to appoint a Committee to inquire, I should have felt that the case for inquiry was obvious. But that is not the line they took. They have a scheme of their own, as the Chancellor said, cut and dried. [Mr. ASQUITH: "No, no."] I think those were the words used. But, at any rate, they have a scheme ready to submit to the Committee. It really would be an advantage to everyone if the main outlines of that scheme were communicated to the House to-day, and I cannot conceive of any reason why it should be withheld from us. It is a matter which concerns every one; it is a matter on which the Committee will be desirous of finding a solution that will take due account of every opinion in the House, and the Committee would be much more likely to arrive at a satisfactory result if they had to guide them in their deliberations the results of a preliminary discussion in the House itself. I think it would serve the interests of the House as a whole if the right hon. Gentleman would communicate to the House in general terms the steps which the Government have decided to recommend to the consideration of the Committee. The changes which the right hon. Gentleman has adumbrated are not small changes. They are not small questions of detail. The proposals which the right hon. Gentleman has adumbrated in the vaguest possible terms may lead to changes, not of procedure only, but changes of a constitutional character in the organisation of that House, in the conduct of its business, and in the opportunities which the House or the minority has to make its views heard upon even the most important questions. This Government ought to be not only willing, but anxious, to take the House of Commons into their confidence at the earliest possible moment. With a desire to assist the right hon. Gentleman to make our procedure business-like and effective, I now appeal to him to take the House into his confidence, and not show a suspicion and a jealousy of it that is undeserved, and which can only tend to make a realisation of our common wishes less likely than it would otherwise have been.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) failed to see what evidence of jealousy or suspicion of the House could be found in the statement of the

Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the Government proposed to lay before the Select Committee as early as possible the plans on which it had decided, and it would be a mere waste of time for the Chancellor to state even the main proposals of the scheme to be submitted to the Committee. It would only lead to a lengthened discussion and could have no good effect. When the Committee reported upon the proposals, it would be entirely within the province of the House to approve or disapprove of their recommendations. The House, instead of being a real working, business-like assembly, was nothing of the kind. Its functions should be two-fold. First, it should be a deliberative assembly, able to discuss both the legislative proposals of the Government and its administrative Acts, and then it should be a legislative workshop. As a deliberative assembly it was not a great success. Many speeches were delivered which no one wanted to hear, arguments were constantly repeated, and the House certainly was not the business machine it should be. He hoped that the Committee when appointed would be representative of all classes and that its aim would be to bring the House into lines which would make it a good modern working appliance. Everybody would desire that it should cease to be a mere talking shop, and should apply itself to good general Liberal work. He was glad, therefore, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken this early opportunity of moving the Resolution, and if he might be allowed to say so, he approved entirely of their proposal not to give the Committee a roving commission, but to place before it definite proposals. The country would rightly feel that the Government with its huge majority should place that majority in a position to do good work. No doubt the Government proposals would be open to amendment should it be found that the wisdom of the Committee was greater than that of the Government. He hoped the House would be steadfast against the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman. A Committee ought to be appointed at once and ought to report as early as possible, either on the proposals of the Government, or upon its own schemes and then, and then only, would be the fitting time for the House to consider the question as a whole, and bring their wisdom to bear on the wisdom of the Committee.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he only rose to take up the words which fell from the hon. Member for Mid Glamorganshire just before he sat down. The hon. Member said that when this Committee had reported the House should have the power of forming a judgment on the scheme as a whole. That was a matter of paramount importance. Under the procedure which this House had followed for centuries, the House had enjoyed the opportunity of seeing the proposals as a whole, and of weighing one part of those proposals as against the others. He put this question to the Government. If this Committee was appointed, and if their scheme was submitted to the Committee, although the scheme had not been submitted to the House, would the House at a future stage have an opportunity of seeing the scheme as a whole which the Government brought forward on its own responsibility as a Government? The Chancellor of the Exchequer in the remarks he had made had caused him some uneasiness. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the Committee would be appointed forthwith, and urged to be expeditious, and that it would be invited to present interim Reports. That raised the whole question of this Committee. Was it to give the House interim Reports, and, if so, was the House to be invited to come to a judgment on these interim Reports, because, if so, the House would not have that which he claimed for it—the right of considering as a whole the scheme brought forward by the Government of the day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said it was very interesting to old Members of the House to hear the different points of view from which right hon. and hon. Gentlemen approached a question when they had changed from the Government to the Opposition side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a touching appeal as representing a small minority of this House, saying that he thought the procedure of the House ought to be a matter of the general consensus of opinion of the House; but some Members would remember that in 1902, when the last procedure rules were carried, they were carried by closure by the

Government in the teeth of a very large minority. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had raised the point that it would be consistent with the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the Committee should make interim Reports upon certain features in the scheme, and that the House should be asked to adopt those schemes and leave over the rest. He earnestly hoped that that was the intention of the Government, because if they wished to get any alteration there was no other chance of their getting soon—this session—any reform of those defects in the present procedure as to which they were all practically agreed. The speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, except for that very circumstance, was one that gave him some little anxiety, because it seemed to him that the Government were going to prepare another great scheme of reform of procedure, with the idea that they could transform the present House of Commons into a real workmanlike and efficient assembly. If that was the hope of the right hon. Gentlemen it meant that these particular changes which, if small, were important, and which, if they could be carried out at once, would add materially to the comfort and efficiency of the House, would be thrown on one side altogether. He was one of those who would welcome most heartily any effort the Government might make to alter certain features of the rules passed in 1902, and if that was their real intention he had great hopes that they might very shortly be able to recommend certain changes to be adopted—before this session came to an end. With regard to the hour at which the House met in the afternoon it was either too early or too late. He knew that the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil took the view that the House ought to meet far earlier than two o'clock. He did not quarrel with that view. If the House could make up its mind to meet and transact its business in the daytime and meet say, at eleven o'clock and stop at six or seven he would be delighted; but if it was going to continue to be a House which insisted on transacting its business at night, two o'clock was a most inconvenient hour to meet, and the hour of meeting ought to be put back to the old hour of three o'clock. Then as to the hour at which the House adjourned—that was a most inconvenient hour, and he hoped the present Government would take that into consideration. The whole character of the House was rapidly changing, and it would change still more. It was ceasing to be a chamber occupied entirely by the wealthier and the leisured classes, and it was becoming a chamber in which the working—he did not mean merely the Labour Members—men of the country who were engaged in earning their daily bread in the professions or in business or by labour occupied a large number of seats. It was also a House in which the proportion of poor men was increasing. They found it impossible to live in the centre of the metropolis; they had to live on the outskirts, and it was a severe tax upon such men that the House should sit to such an hour that they could not get trains and, in order to get home in comfort, were obliged to drive at great expense. He hoped, therefore, that the question of not sitting so late as twelve o'clock would be included in the scheme, and that if the Committee still considered that they should go on sitting until a late hour, they would make up their minds that the sitting must close long before twelve o'clock. With reference to the dinner-hour, no arrangement could be more absurd than the present, and he thought that nothing that had ever happened in connection with procedure had had a worse effect. Before the rule in question was passed —of course it was passed, like everything else then, by the closure—he said it was a device invented for the benefit of the drones and the dummies of the House, and that it would not be of any assistance to the working Members of the House. And that was what happened. What was their experience in the last Parliament? It was supposed the House would stop work from 7.30 to 9 o'clock. But it stopped from 7.30 to 10 or 10.30, because hon. Gentlemen who went away to dinner never came back until then, and meantime night after night they had the ridiculous spectacle of the Government with a nominal majority of over 100 putting up men to talk against time. From 9 o'clock till 10 they, in order to save themselves from defeat, had to do so; and all old Members would remember the scenes that used to take place when the then Member for Peckham threw himself into the breach and talked against time with his eye cautiously on the door watching for the signal that enough Members were back and that he might sit down. The dinner-hour had not benefited anyone really concerned in the work of the House, and he hoped it would be abolished. There was another matter that he would respectfully suggest, viz., that the House ought not to sit any year beyond July 1. The objection to that was that the financial business of the House had to be got through. But he could not conceive why the regulations as to the financial arrangements for the year could not be changed. It might, no doubt, entail some inconvenience temporarily on the Treasury. But he thought there could be no other argument used against it. If necessary let the House of Commons meet in the autumn. Almost every other legislative assembly in the world had an autumn session. Let them sit from the 1st October until Christmas, adjourn until February, and sit to July 1. Just as the attempt to carry on the work effectively in the small hours led to unsatisfactory results, so the attempt to get men to transact serious business with proper attention in the oppressive days of July and August failed. One word more. He had said that he hoped the Government were going to confine themselves, for the time at any rate, to that kind of effort. He trusted that they were not going to embark upon a great scheme in the hope of making the House of Commons a business-like and efficient assembly. If they embarked on this latter course they would meet with the same fate as everybody else who had attempted to deal with this question during the last seventy years. Since 1832 there had been twenty-one such Committees as was now to be appointed. There had been half-a-dozen great schemes for the reform of the business of this House with the object of enabling it to transact its responsible duties. They had all failed. The position of affairs to-day was worse than it was ten, twenty, or thirty years ago, and day by day it was becoming worse. The right hon. Gentleman said something about a scheme for the devolution of business to committees. That was a very large and difficult subject. It had been tried, and they all remembered the high hopes with which the Grand Committees were called into operation. These Grand Committees had been sitting now for years. The House had been sending upstairs Bills for the consideration of the Grand Committees in the hope that the operation would hasten the work of Parliament. They had had no such effect. The Grand Committees had been an absolute failure. ["No."] In his opinion, and in that of the overwhelming majority of those who had had any connection with these Committees, they had been a failure. His own experience was that repeatedly Bills, sometimes almost of a non-controversial character, had been killed in Grand Committee. The number of measures carried into law by the operation of Standing Committees was so small as completely to justify his statement that the Committees were a failure. It was not in that direction that the House could be saved from its present state of inefficiency. He was not going on this occasion to make a Home Rule speech, but he would point out that the House of Commons was endeavouring in one body, sitting for six months, to transact business which would legitimately occupy the time of at least five such assemblies. New Members, deeply impressed with the grievances affecting the mass of their fellow-countrymen, had come here to demand from this new Parliament and new Government, with its unprecedented majority, the settlement of a number of great questions—education, temperance, old age pensions, the position of trades unions, and so forth. How many of those questions did they think could be dealt with in five years? He was in sympathy with all those reforms, and so were his friends, but he uttered this word of warning to those Members who came here filled with an enthusiastic belief that they could get redress: they could not. Any one measure of really first-class importance was as much as could be carried in one session of Parliament, and if a great imperial question arose suddenly it would inevitably have the effect of putting upon one side the consideration of the great social reforms that England, Ireland and Scotland desired. The truth was they were attempting under the present system to be, at one and the same time, the local Parliament of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, and the great Imperial Senate of the nation. They could not do it. The whole experience of the world was against them. With a population of only 5,000,000 in Canada they required seven or eight separate Parliaments; in Australia they found the same; in South Africa they found the same; while in America, with only double the population of the United Kingdom, they had fifty legislative assemblies. They had found out, as Germany had found out, that it was physically impossible to transact local and Imperial affairs satisfactorily in the one Parliament. He would say to this new House of Commons, that, while they might mitigate the rigour of their lot, make it easier for Members to attend, with less sacrifice of health and money and time, do away with some of the worst features of the rules of 1902, they would not succeed, no matter what their desire and their power and their majority, in making this an efficient legislative machine until they lifted off its shoulders the consideration of those purely local affairs with which it was absurd that the time of a great Imperial Parliament should be occupied, and which could only be efficiently and properly transacted under local conditions, governed by local sentiment and local knowledge. He wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer God-speed in this work, and sincerely hoped that before the session was over they might have some limited recommendations from this Committee, by which the House might be enabled to mitigate in some degree the rules unconstitutionally forced upon them by closure by the late Government.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the interesting speech to which they had just listened was the best argument that could be adduced in support of the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire. It appeared to him that as to-morrow was to be a sort of Parliamentary off-day by reason of the postponement of the Free Trade Motion, that day, or a portion of it at least, might well be taken by the Government for a preliminary discussion of the proposals to be submitted to the Committee. The Committee would be expected to work with promptitude and despatch, and if the Committee had for its guidance a discussion of some of the main proposals in the Government scheme they would have an index to the mind of the House which would by most valuable to them in coming to a speedy decision on the points submitted to them. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take the suggestion regarding to-morrow into his consideration. It would save discussion at a later stage of the session, when time was more valuable. Reference had been made to the number of new Members in the House. Those hon. Gentlemen were not bound by the traditions and associations of the House, and if the proposed Committee were to contain a large proportion of new Members, who would bring a free and open mind to the consideration of the question, he was sure the result would be beneficial. Further, amongst the Members to be appointed on the Committee there should be a large proportion of those who had had experience of municipal work. The House of Commons was the laughing-stock of every municipal councillor who paid it a visit. The rules adopted by many town councils might with considerable advantage be applied to the business of this House; and if hon. Members who had experience of the London County Council, or any of the great municipalities in the country, were to obtain a predominance on the Committee, he was sure the result would give satisfaction all round. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had raised several points of considerable interest. There was one more he would like to refer to, and that was the limitation of the time allowed to Members for speech-making. There were addressed, not to the House of Commons, but to constituents outside, long, drawn-out speeches, the reporting of which was very often paid for by Members themselves, and of which the House would be well rid. He hoped the House, therefore, would seriously consider and adopt the suggestion of the hon. Baronet the Member for the Chelmsford Division of Essex in regard to the limitation of speeches. If also the House would take its courage in both hands, and decide to meet not later than noon and rise not later than eight o'clock in the evening, they would have an assembly that would do more business and produce legislation of a better quality than was at present the case. Whatever recommendations were made by the Committee which, while safeguarding the rights of Members, increased the efficiency of the working power of the House, they would find hearty supporters amongst the Members in whose name he spoke.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer suggested that this reference embraced two classes of topics, one of which would require a protracted discussion, and the other consisting of simpler questions which would admit of earlier determination. The right hon. Gentleman evidently contemplated that it might be convenient that the proposed Committee should present an interim Report. One great authority which he had consulted stated that if a Committee desired to present a Report before it had finally completed its inquiry upon the terms of reference, it could do so only by leave of the House. If that was correct it was perfectly clear that words should be inserted expressly authorising this Committee to present an interim Report. If some such words could be added it would be an instruction to the Committee that if they could see their way to present an interim Report, it would meet with the approval of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: I would refer the hon. Member on that point to Standing Order No. 63, which says—

> "Every Select Committee having power to send for persons, papers and records, shall have leave to report their opinion and observations, together with the minutes of evidence taken before them, to the House, and also to make a special Report of any matters which they may think fit to bring to the notice of the House."

I must remind the hon. Member also that the Public Accounts Committee are constantly making interim Reports.

MR. PICKERSGILL: Thank you, Sir.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the limited character of this proposal had not prevented the hon. Member for Mid Glamorganshire making a substantial contribution to the debate travelling over a wide field. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had raised two or three tremendous issues. He had presented to the House a sweeping condemnation of the whole system of Grand Committees and also the more interesting question of the unedifying scenes which had resulted from the change in the dinner hour. If that question was to be gone into on one side it was necessary that it should be gone into on the other. If there was the unedifying spectacle of hon. Members talking against time upon the re-assembling of the House at nine o'clock, surely the discredit was to be shared by those who knowingly in the sight of all men, and under circumstances which were no secret, ingeniously engineered those carryings over until nine o'clock, long after the debates were known to have been completely and finally exhausted in so far as adding to them anything that was new was concerned. There was one practice which ought to be closely adhered to, and that was that the proceedings of Select Committees should be regarded as strictly confidential. Owing to accidental circumstances in the past, private matters had been divulged and persons had been censured. He wanted to know, in case the right hon. Gentleman communicated to this Select Committee a scheme of new rules, whether that scheme was to be jealously guarded as part of the confidential proceedings of the Committee. He supposed that this Select Committee was not going to act wholly without evidence, and that the evidence desired would be mostly the evidence of hon. Members of this House. He suggested that shortly after the assembling of the Committee some steps should be taken which would amount to a publication of the Government scheme as a whole, so it might be laid upon the Table of the House. The question of interim Reports went to the root of the whole question, because, although there was an inherent power of making first and second Reports, it was obvious that any consideration of the procedure rules must fall under some four, five, or six general headings. There was the question of the morning sitting, whether it should be on Friday or Wednesday. Then there were the questions of how Questions should be put and answered in this House by Ministers, of the dinner hour adjournment, of the Supply Rules, of the Thursday rule, and of the deeply interesting question of the time limit, not upon speeches but upon debates. There were also such questions as the hours of the sittings and adjournment, and the devolution of business to Committees. The hours of sitting and adjournment would depend upon what relaxation was allowed during the progress of the sittings, and the devolution to the Committees would depend upon the amount of time which those hon. Gentlemen who were elected to the House had at their disposal. The manner of putting and answering Questions was another part of the general economy of time, and the same might also be said of the dinner hour, the Supply Rules and a time limit. Therefore it could not be said with truth that they could detach any part of this question from another part. There was another great question which arose upon the terms of reference. The reference was—

> "To consider the question of procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the Amendment of the existing rules and upon any new rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business."

Would this Committee be empowered to consider alterations in the rules, which, to carry them into effect, would require statutory authority? He thought it would have been better if the right hon. Gentleman had really made a clean breast of his scheme, if it was in anything like a ripe condition.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said there was a unanimous feeling that some change was necessary in the rules of procedure. The view was not limited to any one side of the House. But the question was whether the proposal of the Government was calculated to bring about the result which they all desired to achieve. He might be alone upon this matter, but he was bound to say that he had difficulty in recognising that there was any need for the appointment of this Committee at all. The Select Committee which had been proposed would not be a Committee in the ordinary sense as they understood it, because the Government had a scheme which they were going to submit, and they would have a majority on the Committee. Therefore, he thought the Government ought to take the responsibility if great changes were about to be made. As it was evidently considered necessary that this Committee should be appointed he would not oppose it. He would remind the House, however, that no Committee was appointed when the last alteration in the rules was made. The late Government had a large majority and were responsible for any changes just the same as the present Government would be responsible for any changes now. Private Members as well as official Members must take the responsibility for any changes that were made. Speaking as a private Member, he rather feared that the appointment of this Committee might go further than the House had any conception of. He noticed that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton was going to be the Chairman, and he would be acceptable no doubt to all Parties. He would be on this Committee as the representative of the Government, and however, generously minded he might be, his first consideration would lie in the direction of what would be best to carry out the desires of the Government. The present Government had been returned to power to carry out great measures of legislation, and they would have his hearty support in utilising the time of the House for carrying out the mandate that the country had given them. During the existence of the late Government, the rights of private Members were practically abolished, and their opportunities for bringing forward Motions were taken away. Their time for debating questions in Committee of Supply was also seriously curtailed by the guillotine, which made it impossible for them to say anything upon the Votes of many of the great departments of the State. He asked the Government to allow private Members to be well represented on this Committee, and he trusted the Committee would not be allowed to go into questions which ought to be left to the whole House. He could see a difficulty with reference to the question raised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Was this Committee going to recommend that the power of questioning Ministers should be limited? If it was, he would offer the recommendation all the opposition he could when the Report was brought before the House. He thought the main questions of procedure which ought to be settled immediately were questions on which the Government should take full responsibility. Even if this Committee made recommendations, the Government would still have to take the responsibility. The Government would take no recommendation of the Committee with which they were not in thorough accord. It seemed to him that one discussion would have been sufficient if the Government could have given the House the scheme they were going to submit. He hoped the scheme would abolish the dinner hour, and do away with the limitation of twenty-three days for Supply. He hoped also there would be an alteration in the hour of sitting on several days of the week, and that the scheme would give them back the Wednesday evening. The suggestion as to more day sittings would be acceptable to those who had nothing else to do but attend to politics and the affairs of this House, and who were supported by the Parties with which they were indentified. At the same time, there were some Members who had their own affairs to attend to as well as the affairs of the House. He thought they might have a day sitting on Wednesday, and still keep the week-end for some members who attached importance to it. He hoped these suggestions would be embodied in the programme of the Government. This matter should not be forced through by a majority, and if the Government scheme had been laid on the Table of the House, a general debate on these points would have enabled the Government to get their proposals through without the delay entailed by the appointment of a Committee. After all, there was little or no evidence to be taken by the Committee. There were a few points on which the opinion of the Speaker or the officials of the House would be necessary, but the changes to be made, in so far as they were personal, would not affect to a great extent the ordinary procedure of the House. Therefore, the Committee to be appointed would be guided by their own personal and private views, and would to a large extent act for themselves. The question of procedure and rules, as a general rule, the House ought to keep in its own hands. Every private Member should have a right to give his views in regard to the proposals without being prejudiced by the importance which might be attached to a scheme brought forward by a Select Committee. It was all very well to say that they would have their opportunity for criticism when the scheme came from the Committee, but they would be told that the Committee was representative of all Parties in the House, that the Committee had come to a decision, and that they must stand by it. He regretted that the Government had thought it necessary to propose the appointment of a Committee, but it was obviously the desire of the House that it should be appointed. The two requests which he had to make were that private Members should be fully represented on the Committee, and also that, when the Committee reported, the Members of the House should have full opportunity of ventilating their views and making any recommendations they thought necessary.

*Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he thought the Government must have realised from what hon. Members had said that they were taking a course which would involve the maximum of inconvenience and the minimum of advantage. They were to-day having what might be called a First Reading debate without the advantage of the explanation by the Minister in charge of the Bill. It seemed to him that this was a question of evidence, and that the best way of obtaining evidence on a matter of this sort would have been to have an ample debate in this House, where every Member could have given his opinion upon the different points. These opinions would have been placed on record, and would have afforded the best materials for a Select Committee of the House when they came to the consideration of the question. That would have been a better way of proceeding than having a select number of Members giving evidence before the Committee. In a matter of this sort it seemed to him more important to get at the real opinions of private Members than at the opinions of those on the Front Bench on whatever side they sat. In regard to this particular reference they were informed that it was formed on the same lines as a reference many years ago. Immediately after being told of that precedent, which undoubtedly would give the Select Committee power to act on its own initiative and frame a scheme on its own ideas, they were told that the Government had a cut and dried scheme of their own which they would submit to the Committee. That was a scheme which the Government with their enormous majority would be able to carry when it was brought to the House. By that means when the Committee came back to the House with the scheme the impression would be given that it was not the scheme of the Government, but a scheme threshed out by, and in accordance with, the general opinions of the Committee. What they were asked to do to-day was to place before a Select Committee the cut and dried scheme of the Government. If that was so, every Member who had any interest in the matter, should point out at this stage what seemed to him desirable in amending the rules, in order that the Committee when considering the cut and dried scheme of the Government might also take these points into consideration. With reference to the changes which took place some time ago he was glad to see that on some points there had been a change of opinion. He objected very strongly in his place in Parliament to the alteration from Wednesday to Friday when it was proposed, and he was strongly of opinion now that it was not a change for the advantage of public business or the convenience of the House. He thought there was a change of opinion with reference to that. With regard to the suggestion that they should revert to three o'clock as the hour of meeting, they must always bear in mind that the Committee work which was done, not in this chamber, but in the precincts of the House, was acknowledged by many to be the most satisfactory part of the proceedings. If they were to accept the suggestion to meet at noon, or eleven o'clock, they would practically destroy the Committee work of this House. He hoped that very great consideration would be given to the matter, and that no hasty conclusion would be arrived at. There was another subject which had been raised in a somewhat, aggressive way, by the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member condemned root and branch the system of Standing Committees. He himself had had much experience of the Standing Committees, and he was convinced that they were a most valuable adjunct of the House. He would only instance one measure with which he happened to be connected a few years ago, namely, the Bill to amend the Factory Act. He did not remember a more businesslike discussion than the one which took place on that measure. The work of the Standing Committee was performed satisfactorily, and in a manner which hastened the passing of the Bill through the House. If the Committee of the whole House had considered the Bill, he was perfectly convinced that it would never have passed into law in that or any subsequent session. In the last week of last session the Chairmen of the Panel met and considered a Report to this House in connection with the business of the Standing Committees. That Report was now available, and he hoped that the Government, when framing the new rules, would study it beforehand. That Report, which was unanimous, pointed out the matters which were impeding the advantageous use of this devolutionary system. He believed himself that the reason why the Grand Committees had got into disrepute at the present moment was that they had suffered from the action of the House, owing to the fact that public Bills in the hands of private Members were often sent to the Grand Committee in order that they might reach a stage further than if they had remained in the House, and so give a chance of proceeding with other Bills. The consequence was that every kind of controversial Bill was constantly being thrown on the Grand Committees. He and others had rightly protested in the House against that practice. There was another disadvantage connected with it. These private Members' Bills came up to the Grand Committee without the authority of a Government Department, and it was very often extremely difficult to get a quorum. Members disliked the idea of being dragged up day after day to consider a Bill which they knew had no chance of passing in the House; they thought it was very much of a farce, and that they ought not to be required to do it. Hence the amount of undignified work thrown on the Grand Committees had rendered their working unsatisfactory and accounted, to a great extent, for the opinion felt in regard to them in the last Parliament. He asked whether the Government could not seriously consider the suggestions of the Panel of Chairmen, and whether the whole system could not be revised with the object of making these Grand Committees more effective. While the Report to which he had referred stated that in those Committees some sort of power of closure should be given to the Chairman, he himself had always stood aloof from that opinion of his brother-chairmen.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member is entitled to discuss the procedure in Grand Committee. The Question of the procedure within the Committee itself is not now before the House.

*MR. LAURENCE HARDY said that unless the Standing Order was altered to enable the Chairman of a Grand Committee to apply the closure, he did not know how this question could come before the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: The way to raise the point referred to by the hon. Member would be to extend the Motion now before the House.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): On a point of order. The Government in their proposal referred to a scheme of devolution. I take it that that applies to something in the form of a Standing Committee. Now, hon. Members who have dealt with these Committees for many years are clearly convinced that one of the greatest drawbacks to their success is the want of power on the part of the Chairman to apply the closure. Is not this the proper time to raise the question, when the Government are proposing a scheme of devolution?

*MR. SPEAKER: In doing so you are going beyond the words of the Motion now before the House.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On a point of order, may I ask whether the Resolution now before the House enables the Select Committee to recommend the granting of closure powers to the Chairmen of the Grand Committees or would that recommendation be *ultra vires* under the terms of the Motion now before the House?

*MR. SPEAKER: The answer to that question is that it would really depend upon the view taken by the Chairman of the Select Committee. It is for him to interpret the limits of the reference, and I would not like to lay down any hard and fast rule in regard to that.

*MR. LAURENCE HARDY thought that the words of the reference would naturally include questions of that character. He might say that the procedure in the Standing Committees were supposed to follow that in Select Committees. The procedure in Grand Committees had, however, changed very much of late from the procedure of a Select Committee and had followed in every detail the procedure of the Committee of the whole House, and the consequence was that the Chairmen of the Grand Committees, in making a ruling, on many points had often found themselves in considerable difficulty. If the procedure of the Grand Committees could be considered by the Select Committee he would suggest that they should lay down more precisely what that procedure should be, and how business should be carried on. There was another point. He was the only Member of the House who had been directly connected with the rule which influenced the position of the Deputy-Chairman. He would suggest that the position of the Deputy-Chairman should be more strictly defined than at present. His duties were undefined, and now that the House had conceded to the Deputy-Chairman a very ample salary he should be given duties corresponding to that salary. In the last Parliament circumstances had arisen under which that rule caused considerable inconvenience. In case of the illness or absence of Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy-Speaker took the Chair; but the Deputy-Chairman could not at once step into all the duties of the Chairman of Ways and Means and of Deputy-Chairman without an announcement being made at the Table that Mr. Speaker was absent from the House for some particular cause. That was rather a difficult position, because, if the Chairman of Ways and Means left his place as Deputy-Speaker, and if he wished the Deputy-Chairman to have full power, he must remove himself at once from the House in order that it might be announced that he was absent. He thought that if it was very desirable to have a fifth wheel to the coach, so to speak, the House should surrender some of its jealousy in regard to these matters, and make a rule that these offices should be absolutely interchangeable without unnecessary formalities. It was advisable that these small details known to those who had had practical experience of their inconvenience, should be considered by the Government.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said that, as he had been a Member of the House for twenty years, he hoped that he might be permitted to point out some of the difficulties which arose from the existing rules of procedure or from the new rules which had been suggested. As to the hour of meeting it would be perfectly impossible to fix an hour which would suit every Member. Supposing the hour was fixed at noon, what would be the result? He was not speaking in a personal sense, for any hour would suit him. But although twelve o'clock might suit a large number of hon. Members who had just come into the House, and who he hoped would come in larger numbers—what would the effect be? First of all, there was a very large class of business men in the House who would not be able to come there and, at the same time, give the necessary time to their private affairs in the hour or two after eight o'clock given in exchange for attending in the House at noon. A second class were the lawyers. He knew it was not a very popular thing to defend the lawyers here or anywhere else. Some people imagined that they could get on very well without them, although he certainly did not think so. It was hard enough for men engaged in their profession all day to get to the House at two o'clock, and he knew that the House had lost a good deal by their absence until three or four o'clock. But if the House met at noon there would be confusion worse confounded. Their presence was not only desirable, but essential for the proper conduct of the proceedings of the House. Then, there were the Ministers. These Gentlemen were in the House until the adjournment at midnight or later. If the House were to meet at noon how could these Gentlemen attend in their Offices to the business of the State? It was perfectly impossible. Another thing was that Committees sat at half-past eleven or twelve, and they could not have all the Committees and the House itself sitting at the same time. Proposals of this kind of change were made at the beginning of every new Parliament, and it was a common thing at such seasons to declare that this was the most antiquated establishment in the country as far as business was concerned. But in spite of that, there was a good deal to be said for the House of Commons after all. Their arrangements had been formed after great consideration, and the reason why they did not work well lay, not in the form, but in the system which had grown up in the House of resolutely preventing business being done. An alteration was made by the late Prime Minister under which hon. Members received written replies to Questions, and that was a very great benefit. He hardly knew of any other rule, however, which was brought into operation at that time which was not a conspicuous failure. The most conspicuous failure was that which concerned the dinner hour, under which the sitting of the House was suspended from half-past seven until nine o'clock. No English gentleman could dine in an hour. A division lasting twenty minutes might be taken at half-past seven. That meant that hon. Members got away at ten minutes to eight, were driven to the other end of London, and yet were expected to be back by nine o'clock to take part in the business of the House. It was an impossible condition of things. It might be all very well for Irishmen and Scotchmen because they would give up their dinners, if necessary, but such a regulation was not good enough for the Englishman who could not be expected to go without his dinner. Therefore the whole system had broken down and scandals occurred during the last Parliament which were disgraceful. They had the Government complaining of obstruction on the one hand, and then, after nine o'clock, placing men on the Ministerial Benches for the purpose of obstruction until hon. Gentlemen could be brought back from their residences. Whatever remained, such an arrangement as that must go. In former times, an hour out of the hour and a half was occupied by speeches which otherwise would never have been delivered and they got into the local newspapers. The time was at all events usefully employed. The only other point he intended to refer to arose out of the right hon. Gentleman's hint as to a scheme of devolution of business upon Committees. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman meant, and his hon. friend the Member for Waterford apparently did not think much of the suggestion. He had always looked upon a scheme of devolution with favour, and he thought that the real reason why Grand Committees had not succeeded so well as they might have done was that the Chairman had not the power of the Chairman of Committees of this House. He recalled one instance in which this power had been very useful, and Scotch Members would remember it very well. There was a Scotch Committee appointed once to deal with a Scotch Bill, and it was one of the most businesslike proceedings that ever took place in the House. His hon. and learned friend had said that he knew perfectly well that there was no substitute for Home Rule, but what he himself said was that if the House would resolve to send Scotch, Irish and Welsh business, or such business as it chose, to Scotch, Irish, or Welsh Committees, there would be plenty of time to do the business of the House, and they could adjourn early three nights a week, and at whatever hour they liked. He thought that the precedent of the Scotch Committee ought not to be lost sight of, and the Government ought, in his opinion, to adopt some such system. He thought, however, that in the matter before the House the Government had been perfectly straight. It was obvious that a Committee must be appointed before great changes could be made, and it had always been the case that changes of this character had been considered by a Select Committee. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] He thought that upon every occasion before the last change was made the matter was considered by a Select Committee. It was obvious that the Government ought to be fortified by the opinion of a Select Committee. This House was a new one, and there were, perhaps, more new Members in it than ever sat in a new House before. Therefore it was desirable that the Government should be assisted by a Committee, and should also ascertain the general view of Members both old and new. He hoped that the Committee would sit promptly, and that this Session would not be wasted. He trusted they would get some report from the Committee containing a recommendation which would thwart the abuse of the rules of the House of Commons which had been known to exist in the past.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said that as the Government had not thought fit to produce a scheme which they must have prepared, at all events in the rough, he thought he might be pardoned, as the result of twenty years experience, for offering a few suggestions as to the way in which he thought the rules of the House might be materially altered. He apologised to the House for intervening in the debate, but he did so for various reasons, one of which was that the Party to which he belonged was specifically and specially attacked by the existing rules. That statement was not a matter of inference, because he had for it the word of the right hon. Gentleman who was now the junior Member for the City of London. That right hon. Gentleman made a speech at Blenheim in 1901 in which he declared that the new rules would be very important from the point of view of restraining the discussions of the Irish Party in this House. The other right hon. Gentleman who divided the Leadership with the junior Member for the City of London did him (Mr. MacNeill) the honour to refer to him personally in that connection. The gist of the rules was that the Irish Members were specially to be hit. He wished to refer to the dodge of blocking Motions, for preventing the discussion, on a Motion for the adjournment, of definite matters of urgent public importance. If anyone would look at the Order Paper upon the last day of the session of the last Parliament he would see at least twelve Motions, every single one of which was put down to prevent the discussion of matters of public interest. These Motions were carefully prepared in the Whip's Room, and the moment anything of importance occurred, and it was supposed that a Motion for adjournment might be moved on a matter of urgent public interest, a blocking notice at once appeared upon the Paper in order to destroy the opportunity of discussion. The last page of the Orders of the Day last session was certainly a curiosity. One hon. Member went to excess in the matter. He was afraid that there might be a Motion to discuss the scandal of blocking Motions, and he actually put down a proposal to discuss them, with a view of averting a Motion for the adjournment of the House. A Motion for adjournment upon the Cass case was discussed for some seven or eight hours, and ultimately carried. The time occupied was not too little considering that the liberty of the subject was involved. Now a Motion for the adjournment was relegated to the evening sitting, and, as all the time that could be obtained was three hours, the discussion was necessarily confined to a very few men. In his judgment if a subject was of sufficient interest to be called attention to on a Motion for adjournment, it was of paramount importance and should be taken the first thing. Otherwise it should not be made the subject of such a Motion. He should never forget the first Motion for adjournment under the new rule, when Mr. Speaker Gully, on the necessary number of Members rising, said—

> "The hon. Gentleman will bring his Motion on at the evening sitting at nine o'clock."

He should never forget the excitement of hon. Gentlemen who never spoke themselves and did not break the record of Balaam's Ass, which only spoke once. He thought the old Motions for adjournment should be restored, and he was speaking in favour of right hon. Gentlemen who when they were in the Government themselves gagged the House. The rules had never been properly codified; they had been merely strung together, being made under very different circumstances and having very different effects. The rule which forbade anyone from saying anything disparaging of judges, Governors-General of India or other high officials, was a very proper rule, but when it was passed it was passed for the purpose of giving the friends of anyone attacked a proper opportunity of defending them. These matters were then made the subject of a special Motion. If the senior Member for the City would look into old cases he would see that the judges were inveighed against in a manner which was not possible now. But the effect of the present rule was to make a judge immune from criticism, which was a thing that ought not to be permitted. That was the case with many of the rules. They were passed under different circumstances, and were now used in a way that it was never intended they should be. Then there was the question of the interrogation of Ministers across the floor of the House. The hon. Member for South Tyrone sang a triumphant pean of praise on the new answer rules, but though the rule affecting answers to matters of detail being given in the Votes worked well, it was quite a different thing with regard to the Answers made in the House. That rule destroyed the power of interrogating Ministers across the floor. This Parliament was only a few days old, yet there were seventy-four Questions starred for oral answer, of which only fifty were answered owing to the absurd time limit. It might be a matter of great importance which a Member desired to raise by a Question to the Minister, but if the Member was not in time, or if, through some arrangement of the Questions being put in groups for the convenience of Ministers, the Question was not reached, the interrogator had to be content with a written answer which did not permit of a supplementary Question being put. He thought it would be better to go back to the old rule and put up with a little inconvenience and waste of time so that any hon. Member who wished to interrogate a Minister should have the opportunity of doing so. He desired to say also that one of the great scandals of the Procedure Rules in the late Parliament was the abuse of the Ten Minutes Rule. When it was first introduced the House was told by right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench that it would only be used for the introduction of Bills of secondary importance, but it had, on the contrary, been used to introduce Bills of first class importance, and he thought some alteration should be made to ensure that only Bills of minor and secondary importance should be introduced under that rule. He was also strongly opposed to the rule of two o'clock for the meeting of the House. The hour of meeting was not early enough to allow hon. Members to do a day's work in the daylight, and it was too early from the other point of view. When he first entered the House they met at four o'clock, which gave time for hon. Members to do a day's work for themselves before coming down. For his part he would like to see Parliament conducted on the same lines as the business of the law courts. Parliament should no longer be a lounging ground for the wealthy and leisured classes. He should like to see it meet at ten o'clock. Hon. Members ought to give their best efforts to Parliament. He himself was here far from home and gave his whole time and attention to the House, and in his opinion the rule that destroyed the half holiday on Wednesday and gave them five days' hard work without a break imposed too great a strain upon hon. Members. It was never intended to benefit the working Members of the House, but to extend the prerogative of that dangerous element, the "weekenders," who had for so many years carried on the government of the country. He would gladly see even Saturday sittings from the commencement of the session. The old Members of the House perhaps thought more of their own immediate interests than of those of their constituents. Why should not the House sit on Saturdays and give their best time to those whom they represented? Why hon. Members should not do their work he did not know. If the House did not meet at eleven o'clock he would rather they met at four o'clock or half past three than at two o'clock. He considered that the Wednesday afternoon sitting should be substituted for the Friday afternoon sitting.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said as a Member of twenty years standing he was very glad this Motion was introduced, and he would support the Government to the best of his power. He could not conceive things being worse than they were at present, and he hoped real and substantial changes would he brought about. They wanted something practical. What did it matter whether a Member took an hour or an hour and a half for his dinner, whether he ate a dog biscuit in a corner of the lobby, or whether he went home at midnight or later? They wanted something larger than that, and there was only one thing that could do them any good. They could economise the time of the House. All the rest was leather and prunella. What they wanted the Government to do was to shorten the opportunity for the exercise of the dialectical ability of hon. Members. There was no conceivable reason why it should not be done. They had tried to do it pretty often, and although they were supported by the President of the Local Government Board on one occasion they were not always successful; but, to use an ordinary phrase, they were not down-hearted. The first occasion on which the subject was brought up since he had been a Member was when the hon. Member for Boston introduced a Bill proposing that the speeches of Members should be curtailed by the ringing of a bell. The next time they brought in a Bill they were aided by the right hon. Gentleman opposite and there was a good majority. Then they introduced a Resolution and got a majority of three to one, but after that Ministers took uncommonly good care they should never carry a Resolution of the kind again. Why should not the Government incorporate such a proposal in their Bill or Resolution, or whatever they might bring forward? In the London County Council there was a time limit. In the Church House, although it looked like flying in the face of Providence to closure a bishop, there was also a time limit. The same rule applied in the United Service Institution. Why should it not be introduced into this House? Hon. Members might say, and had said, that the present custom was good enough for their predecessors 100 years ago, and it ought to be good enough for the Assembly to-day. But things were different. A good deal of water had run under the bridge since then. Hon. Members elected to this House a century or less ago did not come here to speak. If they looked up the journals of the House they would find that not more than fifty Members on either side of the House ever talked at all. They sat silent or applauded their leaders, and got their reward by promotion to another place.

But it was all different now. Hon. Members were obliged to speak, to put Questions, and to introduce Bills. Reluctant as he was always to interfere and take up the time of the House, he was forced by his constitutents to introduce a Bill for the compulsory marking of shrimps. Since he had been in the House he had seen some shocking instances of how the time of the House was taken up with absolutely nothing. He remembered hearing four members of the medical profession talk for four hours on vaccination. He remembered an hon. Gentleman, now on the other side, talk for an hour and a quarter on a bog in the Hebrides. How could they expect the business of the House to be carried on properly when such things were allowed ? He would suggest that the new Government should bring themselves honour and glory in the first session by helping the House to kill the Jabberwock which they had so often tried to do, but failed.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) considered that the questions of the time at which the House should meet, the dinner hour, and the day on which the morning sitting should be held were questions for the House itself and not for the Government to decide. When the question was previously under discussion, Members implored the late First Lord of the Treasury to allow the House to pronounce its opinion, especially on the question of the half day being on Wednesday or Friday, without the intervention of the Whips. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Ashford in what he said about early meetings of the House, and he earnestly hoped the House would go back to the Wednesday arrangement instead of the Friday. Four nights in succession at the House made a great tax upon the Members, and especially upon the officials of the House. He wished to call attention to the question of Supply. Primarily the business of the House was financial—the control of the whole expenditure of the State—and it was a great responsibility they shared with no other place. It was a great misfortune, and indeed a scandal, that Parliament should be called upon to vote millions of money without discussion. He would like to see six or eight or twelve votes put down for a night and as soon as the discussion on any vote began to flag he would like to see the closure put on, at the end of an hour or two according to the importance of the subject, instead of allowing a sort of trivial talk on one vote to monopolise all the time. He also desired to see the discussion on Votes on account confined to the questions whether too much or too little was taken, and whether any new Votes were taken which ought not to be taken on a Vote of account. He did not know whether the Committee would have power about holidays. He hoped there would not be such long Easter and Whitsuntide holidays, as they necessarily prolonged the session. Most would like to have the shortest possible holiday at Whitsuntide in order that they might get away in July.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devon, Honiton) associated himself with hon. Members on both sides in welcoming the announcement of the Government. It was time something was done; he had felt for some time that the House was losing the confidence of the country as an efficient machine for carrying out the will of the people and representing the opinions of the country. That loss of power and efficiency was due to many causes, but partly to the omnivorous appetite of the House itself, which claimed to deal with every matter, great and small, over the whole area of the Empire, and also of local government, and was most unwilling to part with any of its jurisdiction either to Grand Committees or to local bodies. There was a determined effort some years back to bring about a system of obstruction by which the House should be deliberately prevented from carrying out its own will. If some better means could be devised in regard to the procedure of the House, he would heartily welcome it. Their Leader, whom he had hoped to welcome back that day and who was never afraid of tackling thorny questions, made an honest attempt to deal with the subject, and allowed the House to make the experiment of transferring the half holiday from Wednesday to Friday. That was not merely a laudable attempt to please the wealthy and luxurious, the drones and the dummies, of whom they had heard that day; it was felt that the business should not be transacted alone by the professional politician, but that those connected with the great industries of the country should be able to attend to the business of the House without sacrificing their own private interests. He regretted the change because it put too great a strain on both Members and officials. They had been passing through a comparatively quiet time, but there might come a time when great constitutional questions were at stake and a conflict between the two Houses of Parliament might arise. He had been told that the interval on Wednesday used to be most valuable to enable differences to be settled and to avoid that friction and heat which they all deprecated. Therefore he hoped the short sitting on Wednesdays would be restored. As for the dinner hour arrangement at present existing, it seemed to him really to be a waste of time. With regard to private Bills he thought the system by which one hon. Member was able to block a private Bill was too great a power to place in the hands of one man, although it might be used occasionally to prevent vexatious measures from passing. He thought the object of the Government had been attained by this discussion, and he hoped some practical proposals would be forthcoming which would restore the confidence of the country. It would be a very dangerous thing if the country lost confidence in the House of Commons, and he trusted that confidence would be maintained by the substitution of rules of a moderate and useful character.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.) said that last session certain days were allocated for the discussion of certain matters, and what happened? One whole night was occupied discussing matters of very small moment, and when the end of the session arrived important questions had to be passed without any discussion at all. The same thing might happen the next session and the session after that, and they might again have one of the most important departments of the State passing Estimates without any discussion at all. That was not at all satisfactory and would not be considered so, he felt sure, by any section of the House. He thought that a certain amount of time ought to be allocated each session to two or three particular departments, and the next session the time ought to be devoted to the discussion of departments which had not been discussed in the previous year, and in this way every department would get a full discussion of its Estimates in turn. At one period of the session they were engaged in marching through the lobby, and all the good that this did was to allow those who had not attended the debates regularly to increase their records in the division lobby. He objected to scores of millions of pounds being passed without discussion, and if some change in this direction could be made it would be a distinct gain to the public service. With regard to the great waste of time caused by the present method of taking divisions, he thought some change was necessary. In the present Parliament there was a very large number of Members who would vote on one side, and consequently they would have a very large number in the same lobby. He would suggest that as soon as the clerks were at the desks and the tellers at the doors, hon. Members should be allowed to pass through after having their names marked off, and then they could be counted without waiting for the whole House to be cleared. In this way they would be able to save at least five minutes upon each division. With regard to the practice of clearing the House, he thought it was absolutely unnecessary, and he would remind hon. Members that it was quite a modern custom. It was not the practice to clear the House at all until quite a recent period. He trusted those suggestions would be considered by the Committee. Personally, he did not think tellers were necessary, and they might have a turnstile which would register the number of persons passing through. In that case they would not require any tellers at all.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) said he was glad to have the opportunity of saying a few words on this question, because it was a matter in which for a long time past he had taken a very great interest, and one in which he thought all Members were greatly interested, no matter to which side of the

House they belonged. He trusted that in the matters left for the consideration of the Committee this principle would not be lost sight of, namely, that the regulations of the House should be framed in some such way as to prevent the waste of vitality caused by the late sittings of the House. This was the only Parliament in the world which conducted its public business in the middle of the night, when, at a time when their vitality for natural causes was beginning to wane rather than to increase, they applied themselves to tasks which required the whole powers of mind and body. He trusted, therefore, that any alteration of the rules would take the direction of reducing the lateness of the hour until which the House sat. The rule at the present time was that the Speaker should adjourn the House at one o'clock but he would suggest that that should be altered to midnight, and the other rule he would like so altered that the main business which was now interrupted at midnight should in future be interrupted at eleven o'clock. He had sat in five consecutive Parliaments and,having watched carefully the working of these rules, he had come to the conclusion that if this rule could be carried it would conduce to the better and more efficient conduct of public business. It might be argued that the discussions in the House could not be carried out in the time proposed to be allotted. It might be asked if they abridged by one hour that time, how were they going to get through the business in the short time that would remain? His answer was that any alteration of the rule should provide some means for effecting a reasonable curtailment of debate. Of course, a great deal must be left to the taste of hon. Members themselves. He should like to see an automatic division taken at seven o'clock every night, provided the measure before the House had been under discussion two hours; but in case a Minister moved that the automatic division should not then be taken it might be allowed to go forward to a second automatic division, say, at ten o'clock, by which time, if the dinner hour was abolished, the division could be taken. This would enable the question to be settled after it had been vigorously, tersely, and clearly discussed. The French Chamber met at twelve and rose at six o'clock, and if the deputies could conduct the business of the French nation in six hours, he did not see why the British House of Commons, if it met at three and carried on its work till eleven o'clock without interruption, should not be able to get through its business. He hoped the Government would consider that suggestion.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he was glad that this discussion had arisen because the elucidation of the opinions entertained by hon. Members would be of great service in future. He hoped that no change would be effected in the arrangements now prevailing under the new rules which prevented the obtrusion of private business into this House at any time. Before 1902 they were not secure at any time; and the whole control of the business of the House was in the hands of Parliamentary agents instead of the Government. This most seriously embarrassed business, and he was sure that the change which had taken place had been highly beneficial to private business, while the fact that the control of the House over its own proceedings had been resumed was a great benefit to all Parties. He wished to refer to the interrogation of Ministers. He believed the system which prevailed in the House of Commons was unique. He believed that the system of personal interrogation across the table was confined to this Assembly, and he was most jealous of this right. It was a right which secured the interest of the people, and kept Ministers, if he might use a colloquial expression, up to the mark. He was sure it tended to efficiency in administration. He hoped that they would revert to the Wednesday half-holiday. That was a duty which the House owed to its officials. If attendance four nights a week consecutively was excessive for hon. Members who had the privilege of coming and going, what must it be for the officials who were detained during the whole of the time? That was unfair, and the convenience of Members was secondary to the health and efficiency of those who served them so ably and well. He voted against the change from Wednesday to

Friday, and he would gladly vote for a reversion to the old system. As to the question of devolution, he had long served on the Law Committee, and his opinion was that so long as the House delegated to Standing Committees the duties they were intended to undertake the work had been done efficiently. What was not intended to be delegated to the Standing Committees was highly controversial business, and when that kind of business was devolved on them the tone of the Committees changed. He believed that the just complaint which had been made in regard to those Committees had arisen from that mistaken devolution. It began when the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was sent to be considered by a Standing Committee. That was a highly controversial matter, and it introduced a totally new spirit into their debates. He hoped that in future a rule would be laid down that no Bills of a highly controversial character were to be delegated to these Committees. He believed it would be easy to devise such a rule. The change which had been made in the hours at which the House met had lessened the time at the command of these Committees, and although they did to a certain extent sit when the House was sitting it was very inconvenient and highly undesirable to do so. They must have regard to the efficiency of any Committee to which the business of the House was delegated. The sitting of Committees during the sitting of the House did so far diminish the efficiency of the House. That was a matter which must be carefully considered by those who had the permanent settlement of the rules. He thought there had been too severe condemnation of the rules proposed by the late Prime Minister. He did not say that all those rules ought to be maintained or that improvement was impossible, but he did say that benefit had arisen from many of them. He hoped that the changes now to be made would assist the new Parliament in the conduct of its work.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Sir HENRY FOWLER, Wolverhampton, E.) said the debate this afternoon had been a very admirable one for enabling hon. Members to state their views in the manner which he understood the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire desired that they should be stated to the House, and, through the Press, to the public. He thought the debate also had fully justified the course which the Government had decided to take, namely, to move for the appointment of a Committee to consider the whole question. When the Report was presented the changes recommended would be fully discussed. One fallacy seemed to him to pervade the debate, however, namely, that the House was parting with its powers and delegating them to the Committee. The House was not asked to do anything of the sort; it was asked, as it had invariably been asked before when any great change in the rules was contemplated—except in the unfortunate instance of the rules of 1902—to refer them first to a Committee. The immediate precedent for their proceeding to-day was that of exactly twenty years ago. At the end of February, 1886, Sir M. Hicks Beach, who had been the Chancellor of the Exchequer, presented to the Committee a series of changes which he proposed to make, and which were by no means interdependent, any more than the changes which the Government now proposed would be interdependent. They were discussed, and the Committee by no means accepted them; they accepted some of the most valuable ones, and altered others, and added to them. The Committee which it was proposed now to appoint would have as free a hand as possible in dealing with all recommendations; they would be able to take all the steps that might be required—to take evidence if it seemed desirable, and, of course, evidence, if taken, would be printed and laid before the House. The Government had no cut-and-dried scheme. As a matter of business, in order to facilitate the working of the Committee, and they themselves being responsible for the conduct of the business of the House, the Government would submit to the Committee the changes which they recommended, and the Committee would deal with them as they thought fit. He agreed that the Committee must be a representative one, and it was very difficult to limit its numbers; but he thought the House would agree that it must not be too large a Committee if it was to work rapidly and effectively. His desire was that it should be a strong Committee, one whose opinion would be valuable to the House, and would tend to guide their ultimate deliberations. Many defects in the procedure of the House had been referred to; he was sorry to have to say, as one of the old Members of the House, that he thought its procedure was in the most unsatisfactory state it had ever been in. He entirely agreed with one hon. Member, who said it could not be worse. He thought a great many valuable suggestions had been made that afternoon. With regard to the holidays at Easter and Whitsun, however, the hon. Member who objected to those holidays could, of course, move an Amendment when the proposal was made that the House should adjourn; but his experience was that generally the House found fault with the shortness of those holidays, and an appeal was made for their extention. They were familiar, also, with a proposal sometimes made to the Leader of the House that if the holidays were extended business would be hurried on rapidly. After all, the House must recollect that the Leader of the House was responsible for the business of the House being done. He did not think that was a very serious complaint. The reference in regard to the dinner hour and one or two other matters justified his right hon. friend in having made this proposal. He thought that the Committee should report as soon as possible, because delay on this question, which excited the greatest interest in all quarters of the House, until the presentation of a great scheme for dealing with our whole business would be most unwise and most unsatisfactory. He hoped the very first thing the Committee would take up would be the present hours of sitting. As to Grand Committees, he knew that they were not working as rapidly or as satisfactorily as they ought to have done. But he would remind the hon. Member for Waterford that they had passed a great number of valuable measures which never would have been put upon the Statute-book without the aid of the Grand Committees, and great reforms of a most valuable character, such as the Scottish Private Bill Procedure Act and Mr. Ritchie's Bill with reference to local government and temperance. The number of Bills which had received the Royal Assent with the assistance of the Grand Committees within the last four or five years amounted to 124.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: How many of these were Irish Bills?

***Sir HENRY FOWLER** said he did not know. The weakness of the Grand Committee system had been the departure from the principle Mr. Gladstone laid down, and the sending of controversial Bills to these Grand Committees. It was Mr. Gladstone's intention that the Grand Committees should only deal with non-controversial Bills, and that they should settle only details which the House itself had not time to give proper attention to. These were questions which would come under the consideration of the Select Committee, and also the very considerable evils which could not have been foreseen, but which had appeared in the actual working of the Grand Committees. He was sure that any Committee sitting on this question would deal with these and other suggestions. He himself, if on the Committee, would look upon them with a perfectly unprejudiced mind, and he was convinced that the Committee would make their supreme consideration, not the convenience of individual Members, but the general good of the House and its ability to discharge its business most effectively and rapidly.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY: Does the Reference to the Select Committee cover recommendations which would require the authority of a statute to give them effect?

***Sir HENRY FOWLER** said that the recommendations of the Committee could have no power whatever in that direction; and the House could either accept or reject them. If the House should accept any recommendation and it required statutory force to give it effect then the statutory force would be given to it by Parliament. For instance, if the Committee recommended any change as to the sitting of Parliament or said that Parliament should close at a certain date, such a proposal would require an Act of Parliament. It was the prerogative right of the Sovereign and of the Sovereign alone in this country to summon Parliament and to prorogue it.

By the constitution of the United States the date of the meeting was fixed, but our Parliament was summoned to meet by the Crown. The Committee might express an opinion that the House—as he himself thought was desirable—should meet in the autumn. This subject was discussed some years ago on a Resolution brought forward by Sir George Trevelyan, and the suggestion that Parliament should meet in November was carried by a majority. He hoped that the House would now accept this Motion so that the Committee could be nominated as soon as possible, and get to work.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked if the Government would, after they had communicated their suggested reforms, make the House at large acquainted with those suggestions? That could easily be done by laying a Paper. Without such a Paper Members who might be called on to give evidence before the Committee would not have time to give proper consideration to their evidence as to what would be necessary or useless.

* SIR HENRY FOWLER said that that was a matter purely in the discretion of the Committee. It would be very inconvenient, and he knew of no precedent for it.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): But after the Committee have arrived at an opinion upon a definite subject—for instance, the hours of sitting—will that be presented to the House, or will that be kept until the Committee have finished their work and presented their Report to the House?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I think it would be very inconvenient if discussions on any particular proposal were carried on at the same time in the House and in the Committee.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: But will every recommendation made in Committee be reported to the House?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: If any member of the Committee makes a recommendation, that will be recorded and a division taken upon it. I should think it very possible that the Committee would like to have the opinion of Mr. Speaker, the Clerks at the Table, or other officials of the House, and that will in due course be reported to the House.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: When a matter, such as a change of hour, is passed by the Committee, is that decided straight away?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Oh, no. If the Committee decides to make an interim Report, which I gather it is the general sense of the House that they should, the Government will give the fullest information of the details to the House which will deal with it.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) thought that from the course of the discussion the right hon. Gentleman might congratulate himself on having obtained the opinions of some hon. Members on many interesting points. That showed that they ought to have had longer notice of the proposals of the Government in order that they might have had the opinions of hon. Members more widely taken. As he understood—and this point was raised by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy—this Committee would bring its Report to the House backed by the great authority derived from its composition, which, to a large extent, would be Ministerial, and by the fact that the changes had been suggested by the Government. He put it, what opportunity would there really be for the House at large to have a free hand with regard to the recommendations made by such a Committee?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that the changes recommended would have to be passed as Standing Orders of the House, and there would then be ample opportunity for discussing them.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS said the right hon. Gentleman had missed his point. He alluded to the weight of authority with which the Report would come to the House, a Report based on insufficient knowledge of the opinions of private Members. He would not enter into the details raised by some hon. Members on which, as a Member of twenty years standing, he also held opinions of his own, but he must say that he did not see how the opinions of these private Members could reach the Committee before the Committee came to a decision. He would put one point like that touched upon by the hon. Member for North Norfolk who spoke from behind the Ministerial Benches with regard to the financial business of the House. It would be within the knowledge of some hon. Members that a proposition was formerly under the consideration of the House to have an Estimates Committee formed of Members from both sides of the House which should agree as to the comparative importance of the various Estimates and the amount of time that ought to be devoted to their discussion. It had always seemed to him that one of the most debatable points was as to how the time devoted to the Estimates should be distributed. Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether that proposition would be considered by the Select Committee: would it be contained in the unwritten reference to the Committee with the view to facilitating the saving of the time of the House and rendering its business more effective?

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) could not understand why the Government did not bring forward their own views and ask the House to express an opinion upon them. Private Members would like, he thought, to know the Government views. There was one matter upon which the House was almost unanimous, and that was that the two o'clock meeting caused the greatest inconvenience. It would be very simple for the Government to put down a Motion on that subject on the Paper—a proposed Standing Order—and ask the House to vote upon it according to their convenience. They did not want a Committee to inquire into such a simple matter as that, and to appoint one was a pure waste of time. He did not understand whether the Committee would take evidence or not, or what opportunity private Members would have of laying their views before the Committee. Would they have the right to write a letter to the Chairman, and, if they did, what guarantee would they have that it would be considered?

There was a matter about which there could not be any question at all, and that was that the adjournment over dinner was a great convenience to very many Members, and a very great relief to the officials of the House, to whom it must be very tedious indeed to sit throughout a continuous sitting. As to the short sitting being upon Wednesday or Friday they all had their own opinion, and even Members whose first session it was were able to come to a conclusion in regard to which day was the best upon which to deal with private Members' Bills and rest in the evening. His private opinion was that Wednesday was the more convenient day, and that private Members had suffered greatly in consequence of the change to Friday. He sympathised with the view that the interests of private Members had been jeopardised by the change from Wednesday to Friday. This session a division would, in the great majority of cases, take twenty-five minutes, and it must be remembered that a comparatively small number of Members could challenge one. Let the House consider the delay which must inevitably take place under these circumstances. In the French Chamber a division took twelve minutes, and in this House, ordinarily, it occupied only twelve or fourteen minutes; but this session, as Parties were now balanced, and if the Government carried with them the Nationalist and Labour Members, every division must, as he had said, take twenty-five minutes. He therefore thought that some better means of taking divisions should be devised. He hoped the Government would withdraw the Motion and abandon the Committee. He could not understand what the Committee was going to do, and everybody had agreed that the Motion was absolutely useless. For himself he could not see why the Government should not put their views on the Paper, and let them take a division upon them after such discussion as was necessary.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said the speeches they had had from the opposite side of the House had all condemned the rules and regulations laid down by the late Government a few years ago. He did not see how the appointment of a Committee could be avoided, and pointed out that the Government would have a majority upon it. When the Report came back, therefore, it would practically be in accordance with the wishes of the Government, and would pass through the House without much debate. He should like to say that new Members like himself had found out during the last fortnight that the adjournment from half-past seven to nine o'clock was an absolute waste of time. It was much too short a time to go home or to go to one's club, and much too long an interval in which to wait about the House. If the Committee took the middle course, and recommended the giving up of one hour of the hour and a half, and that the House should close at eleven o'clock, it would be for the advantage of all. For himself he did not care how early they met; they might meet at nine o'clock if they liked, and also meet on Saturdays. After all, they had pledged themselves to attend the House and do the work of the nation, and they ought not to make a holiday or a beanfeast of the business. They should do the work properly in fulfilment of their pledges to their constituents. He hoped a change would be made in regard to the starred Questions, so that the Government of the day would be bound to answer all of them. The opportunity of questioning Ministers was very precious, and if the period of interrogation was cut short at a particular period they should never get the Answers which they required in the interest of the country. One of the most important matters the House had to deal with was the examination of Supply, of which all Governments tried to prevent the discussion. He should like the House to be allowed to look after that part of its work in a businesslike way. He sympathised with the hon. Member who suggested a time limit for speeches; there was a sort of feeling that no man was fit to sit on the Front Benches unless he could make a speech of at least an hour in length, and right hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that they would be deemed incompetent unless they could speak at that length. He was not against the closure, although it operated unjustly against some hon. Members; but a time limit of ten minutes would do no one any harm. This would mean that the speeches of hon. Members would be reported in provincial papers, and unless one got reported what was the good of making a speech. A ten-minutes speech was as much as they wanted to hear from anybody. He was also in favour of the devolution of the business of this House, as a good deal of time which should be devoted to Imperial matters was taken up by local business. He was also in favour of the six o'clock sitting on Wednesday. The making of a short day on Friday only encouraged hon. Members to go to Margate, which they ought not to do, and encouraged them to idleness in regard to the duties which they were sent to Parliament to discharge. If the changes he suggested were made they would be able to carry on their business in the future better than the late Government wanted it carried on.

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the question of Procedure in the House of Commons, and to report as to the Amendment of the existing Rules and upon any new Rules which they may consider desirable for the efficient despatch of business."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

[Mr. CALDWELL, on the Motion of Sir Henry Fowler, took the Chair as Deputy-Chairman.]

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

SUPPLY [27TH FEBRUARY] REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1905-6.

Class II.

1. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £130, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of Registry of Friendly Societies."

Class VII.

2. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £36,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and other Expenses of Temporary Commissions, Committees, and Special Inquiries."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the British Commission for the Milan International Exhibition, 1906."

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

4. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £9,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department."

Class III.

5. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,600, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Class V.

6. "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £500, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Expenses in connection with His Majesty's Missions Abroad."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £54,683, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for paying to the French Government the Compensation awarded to French Fishermen on the Treaty Shore of Newfoundland."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,567, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, for the Settlement of the Samoa Arbitration Claims."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he again called attention to the item included in the Vote for the purposes of the Redistribution Committee. There were one or two points on which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had promised them information, namely, how was the £1,200 expended, for what purpose it was permitted, and whether any Report had been issued. Right hon. Members opposite had never seen the Report, and no information could be extracted from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to it. He submitted that the House was entitled to know where the matter stood, and if the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board could give any information with regard to the matter he would prevent the necessity of any discussion.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) said, in reference to the Departmental Committee appointed by the late Government to consider the question of redistribution, that the Committee consisted of Colonel Johnstone (who was now in South Africa) as Chairman, Mr. Glen, a lawyer, and Mr. Thomas, an able official of the Local Government Board. The Committee prepared tables and maps and the information as to population and boundaries which was necessary in order to carry out the work submitted to them on the lines of the Resolution discussed in 1905. They were to prepare a scheme to submit to the Government, and, after the expenditure of a great deal of time and money, a scheme was submitted to the Government. Shortly after the Committee reported, however, the Government went out of office, and on going out, for reasons he did not dispute, they wished that the Report should be regarded as confidential. In similar circumstances, possibly, he would have done the same. The officials of the Local Government Board were informed that the Report was to be so regarded. Until that embargo was removed, he thought no other course was open to him but to take the line he took yesterday and to decline to give publicity to the contents of the Report. He had communicated with the late Prime Minister, whose illness they all deplored, and with his predecessor at the Local Government Board, with the result that they removed the embargo of confidence, and therefore he would do his best to have the document made public as soon as possible. He wished to take that opportunity of thanking the late Prime Minister and his predecessor for the courtesy and promptitude with which they had acted in the matter. He was pleased that the document was to be made public, and he hoped that would satisfy the House; but, in saying that, he trusted that this particular instance would not be taken as a precedent, for he could well understand that circumstances might occur in which the continuity of confidence between one Government and another ought to be adhered to.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN expressed the indebtedness of the Members of the late Government to the right hon. Gentleman for the perfect courtesy and frankness with which he had treated them. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke yesterday, he did not appreciate the motives which induced him to treat this Report as a confidential document, and he then said that the responsibility for keeping the document confidential or making it public must rest with the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues. He did not then understand that he was maintaining the secrecy of the document out of a feeling of loyalty to his predecessor, and he desired to acknowledge the motive which actuated him and to make it quite clear that he was not in any way improperly criticising his action. Both his right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin and himself were quite certain there could be no objection to the publication of the Report, and he was glad to hear that that was the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) was very glad the Government had given way on this point. When public money was expended in this way the result ought to be made public—at least to the Members of this House. He desired to ask the Financial Secretary of the Treasury if he could now give the information asked of him yesterday with regard to the London Locomotion Commission. He also hoped the President of the Local Government Board would give fuller particulars as to who had had the £1,200 required for the Poor Law Commission. The House had a right to know whether gentlemen in the employ of the country and already receiving large salaries were being paid additional sums without the consent of the House.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said that the expenditure on the London Locomotion Commission to 31st March, 1905, was £15,048 11s. 11d. and the expenditure in the current year had been £2,267, making a total of £17,315 11s. 11d.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee) called attention to the composition of the Poor Law Commission. It might be fitting, if unfortunate, that he, as the first Labour Member returned to this House from Scotland should have to voice the keen disappointment of the Scottish workers that so far their claims to representation on this Commission had been disregarded. Considering the composition of the present Government, so many of its Members hailing from beyond the Tweed, the Scottish workers felt their exclusion all the more. This matter affected the workers directly, and was one in which they were vitally interested. No one could truly say that any one of those appointed in any sense represented the industrial community of Scotland. He understood the Commission was originally appointed because of the pressure of the unemployed question. If that were so it was all the more necessary that representatives of labour who were in close touch with the workers should be appointed thereon. He might be told that the Government had appointed a direct representative of labour in the person of his friend, Mr. Chandler. They appreciated that and knew he would worthily fulfil the duties placed on him. But the fact that the Government had recognised the advisability of the workers of England being directly represented on this Commission simply accentuated and punctuated the claim of the Scottish workers to similar representation. That fact, to them, was—

> "Like the salmon wriggling on the spear, which made the deadly wound the worse."

Why? Because there was considerable difference in the Scotch and English Poor Law. It might be that the Scottish workers' views would be voiced by those appointed; but their experience was that such work was best done by those thoroughly acquainted with and in touch with the people requiring relief. They respectfully contended that this was one of the matters on which Labour representation would be both beneficial and profitable to the people and the nation as a whole. During the election hon. Members' candidature speeches fairly bristled with sympathy for labour, and they now asked them to put their contentions and promises into practice, and join in appealing to the Government to right this wrong and remove this just cause of complaint of the organised Scottish workers.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said he was sorry that he could not comply with the hon. Member's request that this Commission, which in the judgment of many was large enough and in the opinion of others was too large already, should be added to. The only reason advanced for adding to its numbers was that Scotland had not its share of representation. He did not think that plea could be urged with regard to any appointment of the Government. Scotland had very little cause to complain about the number of distinguished men it had sent to this House, the distinguished men it had added to the Government, and some said the disproportionately large number it had added to the Cabinet. In the House, in the Government, in the Cabinet, and in the ranks of the Labour Party themselves, Scotsmen were very numerous, and, in the judgment of some, were almost the predominant partner. He did not think that the claim of Scotland for a larger representation was so strong as the hon. Member seemed to think. This Poor Law Commission was appointed to make a report upon this serious and complex subject as soon as it could possibly do so. It was seriously considered by the late Government, and he had only to read the names of the very large Commission of eighteen, which had now been made into nineteen, and which the hon. Member wished to make twenty, in order to prove its representative character. In the first place Lord George Hamilton was made the Chairman, and he thought everyone would admit that the right hon. Gentleman would make a very good chairman. Then there was the Right Hon. The O'Conor Don and Sir H. A. Robinson who represented Ireland. There was also the Right Hon. Charles Booth, than whom a better name could not be found. Then there was Sir Samuel Provis representing the Local Government Board, Mr. George Lansbury, Mr. C. S. Loch representing the Charity Organisation Society, Mr. P. J. P. Macdougall, Mr. T. H. Nunn, the Rev. L. R. Phelps, Professor William Smart, the Rev. H. Russell Wakefield, the Chairman of the Central Unemployed Committee, Dr. Downes, the Rev. T. G. Gardiner, Mrs. Burnard Bosanquet, Mrs. Sidney Webb, and Miss Octavia Hill. He thought, with those names, the Commission was sufficiently representative to undertake this work. The Prime Minister not long ago received representatives from the British Trades Union Congress, and they represented that the trade unionists of the country were not adequately represented on the Commission. The Prime Minister listened to their representations and considered that there was great force in the claims put forward by them, and consequently he added to the eighteen the name of Mr. Francis Chandler, a member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, a J.P. for Manchester, and a gentleman who for many years had been Chairman of one of the Lancashire Boards of Guardians. The Government thought, and he fully endorsed their view, that looking at this Commission from the point of view of size, ability, and the various representative sections embodied in the nineteen names, that all sections of the country would be adequately represented, and out of regard for efficiency and the prospects of this Commission completing its labours within two years, they had concluded that it would be a mistake to add to its size. Therefore, he regretted they were not able to accede to the hon. Member's request. If hon. Members for Scotland were smarting under any sense of injustice he had not seen it particularly displayed, but the hon. Member could rely upon it that either by question or discussion when the Report was before the House, Scotland would have an opportunity of making its voice heard.

Question put, and agreed to.

Third Resolution.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. PAUL (Northampton) again called attention to the footnote on the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates which provided that the sum voted for the Milan Exhibition was not to be accounted for to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. He endeavoured to elicit some information on this point yesterday, and the Secretary to the Treasury gave an explanation which was not intelligible to him, and he got no explanation at all from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That was not at all satisfactory. He understood that the present Government were only technically responsible for these Estimates and that really they were the Estimates of their predecessors in office. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire would be able to explain this matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he took no responsibility whatever for the form of these Estimates.

MR. PAUL presumed that the Secretary for the Treasury or the Chancellor of the Exchequer in that case must be responsible. This was not a Party but a constitutional question. The Comptroller and Auditor-General was an officer appointed by statute in 1866 when Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his duty might be described as keeping the nation out of the Bankruptcy Court. He was not responsible to the Treasury or to any public Department, but to this House alone. Although appointed by the Crown he was practically an officer of this House, and like a judge he could be removed only by an address of both Houses of Parliament. Therefore, he was under the special protection of this House and they were bound to see that his independence was recognised and preserved. The present Comptroller and Auditor-General was a man to whom this country owed a debt of gratitude, for it was owing to his energy and acumen that the scandals were discovered which were now engaging the attention of Mr. Justice Farwell and his colleagues. It appeared to be thought by some hon. Members that the duties of the Comptroller and Auditor-General were confined to taking care that the money voted by Parliament was expended for the purposes for which it was voted. But that was not the case. A very important Committee on National Expenditure was appointed by the late Government and it contained some very distinguished men. The Chairman was Sir James Fergusson, and amongst its members was the present Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, the hon. Member for East Mayo, and Sir Edgar Vincent. The Committee took some very interesting evidence and produced a very interesting report. Among the witnesses called was the late Comptroller and Auditor-General, and he laid it down that this official under the Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866 was completely independent of all Departments. The Comptroller and Auditor-General was a Parliamentary officer, and it was important that the House should preserve the independence of that Gentleman. It was, as stated in the evidence of the officer he had already quoted, his duty to report anything which in his judgment it concerned the House of Commons to know. How was the Comptroller and Auditor-General to report to this House if he was not supplied with the information on which his report was to be founded. All Governments had a tendency to extravagance. It was only a question of degree. The least extravagant Government of last century was the Tory Government of the Duke of Wellington. This was not a question of Party at all. The Comptroller and Auditor-General was the man in the country who had most power, if supported by Parliament, to prevent public money from being wasted, dissipated, and squandered. The Treasury, who, he presumed, were responsible for the Estimate now before the House, took it upon themselves to say that the particulars of the grant in aid would not be submitted to the Comptroller and Auditor-General. He had brought this point before the House in vindication of a great public officer.

Mr. McKENNA said that he took the entire blame to himself if the explanation given to his hon. friend was not intelligible to him. He admitted at once that he did not understand the case the hon. Member was laying before the House. He understood that the hon. Member was referring to the prudence of the Treasury in putting such a note as this to the Estimate, and to mean that there ought to be an audit by the Comptroller and Auditor-General. He did not understand him to assert, as he did now, that the Treasury had no authority to do what they had done. If the hon. Member would refer to Class IV. he would find many cases where there was a footnote similar to this. He would find that it had been the practice for grants-in-aid not to be audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General. That had been the case in regard to grants-in-aid for universities and colleges, harbours, and scientific investigations. In all these cases it had been the practice to put a footnote in the Estimates. His hon. friend would say that the repetition of an illegal practice did not make it legal. Whatever authority the Comptroller and Auditor-General had was acquired only by the Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866. His hon. friend had referred to that Act, but he had not carried his researches far enough. If he would read Section 33 he would find that the powers of the Comptroller and Auditor-General were strictly defined and limited. It would be seen from that section that the Comptroller and Auditor-General had no power to audit the £10,000 except by the direction of the Treasury. The Treasury, as a matter of fact, were not bound to have put in any such note in the Estimate at all. The Treasury had acted absolutely constitutionally and within the powers conferred by Section 33 of the Act of 1866. The audit in this case was undertaken by a body in whom the Treasury had perfect confidence. The Treasury could ask them to show the result of their audit whenever they had made it.

*Mr. MORTON said he did not wish to discuss the legality of the procedure; what they had discussed the previous day was a matter of principle. Now they were told that this determination to have no audit was taken by direction of the Treasury. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury said that there was practically an audit by the Commission or body to which the lump sum was given. Just imagine what would be said if the London County Council were to appoint their own auditor instead of the auditor appointed by the Local Government Board! He still maintained that these accounts should be audited by the Auditor-General, and he hoped the Government would give way on this point, and that an assurance would be given that the practice now pursued by the direction of the Treasury would be discontinued in future.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that hon. Gentlemen opposite appealed to him as if he were the responsible Finance Minister, but he did not assume any responsibility for these Estimates.

He, however, did not associate himself with any of the criticisms made on this Vote. He thought the course which had been taken was a wise one, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would turn a deaf ear to the inexperienced opinion of his friends, and continue the usual practice of the Treasury. It was quite untrue to say that there was no audit. What Parliament was asked to do in regard to these various grants-in-aid was to vote a sum of money to a particular institution or body of men, to be expended by that institution or body. What the Auditor-General had to see was that the institution or body for which the House had voted the money had received it.

Question put, and agreed to.

Fourth Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

*Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmorland, Appleby) said that, before the House passed this Vote, he wanted some information in regard to an item of £4,000, which was put down as an excess due to the increase of the staff in connection with the working of the Aliens Act of 1905. Why had this excess expenditure been incurred in the working of the Aliens Act passed only last session? The expenditure under that Act was left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of State, and such expenditure was to be sanctioned by the Treasury. The Secretary of State was to appoint such officers and an immigration board as he might think necessary, and the expense was to be defrayed up to the amount approved by the Treasury. What he asked was what had been got in return for this excess expenditure of £4,000? Certain officials and medical officers drew salaries——

*Mr. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member must limit his criticisms to the sum of £4,000.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said he presumed that the salaries had been paid out of the £4,000. What he asked for was information as to how that money had been spent in the administration of the Aliens Act. It was an excess expenditure, and he presumed that something unforeseen had occurred to cause the Treasury to exceed their Estimates. He contended that they were not getting their money's worth. The failure in the working of the Act justified the opposition which some of them gave to it last session.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that the hon. Gentleman was criticising the principle of the Act, which he could not do. He must confine himself to this increased demand.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said he had wished to raise the question of political refugees being kept out of the country under this Act but in obedience to the ruling of the Chair, he would not pursue the matter further on that occasion.

The SECRETARY of STATE for HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) said he might point out that of this money only £800 had been used for the purposes of the Aliens Act, and that was the first charge which had been made for setting that Act, which came into force on January 1st, in operation. Various officials had been appointed, but he believed that the greater part of this £4,000 would have been included in the ordinary Customs Vote. The sum which was in excess of the ordinary Customs Vote due to the passing of the Act of last year was in respect of the salaries and expenses in connection with the discharge of the duties of the immigration officers under the Act.

Mr. DALZIEL said he wished to call attention to the action of the unqualified members of the staff. There had been some gross cases of negligence in which passengers were prevented from coming into the country and were kept all night at Dover and then were allowed to proceed.

Question put and agreed to.

Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Resolutions agreed to.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) in moving the Second Reading of this Bill stated that it was a Bill to extend the existing Act, to which no objection had been taken by any of the parties interested. In view of some objections, which had been taken to this being made a permanent Bill, he proposed, on going into Committee, to limit its duration to December 31st, 1912. The Bill did not vary in any particular the provisions of the existing Act.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) complained that the right hon. Gentleman had given them no reason why the duration of the Act should be altered to the year 1912.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said the Bill was introduced two years ago by his predecessor, and it ran out in two years. It ran out this year and must be renewed.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY still complained that the Postmaster-General had given no reasons for continuing the Act for six years. Wireless telegraphy was being continually developed, and, in view of the commercial and national, as well as the scientific, importance of the matter, some further explanation should be given before the House tied its hands for this long period. In order to elicit this information, he begged to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON apologised to the hon. Member and explained that the original Act conferred upon the Postmaster-General the power of granting or refusing licences in regard to wireless telegraphy. It was passed two years ago in consequence of new companies springing up. There never had been any intention on the part of the Post Office to deal otherwise than fairly and generously with all concerned, and there had been no complaint from any of the parties during the two years the Act had been in operation. He hoped, therefore, the House would accept this extension Bill, which made no alteration in the original Bill, without further discussion.

Question put, and negatived.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time, and committed for To-morrow.

And, there being no further Business set down for the Afternoon Sitting, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE RACES.

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said the subject to which he desired to call attention was a kindred subject to that which occupied so much time last week. It was concerned with a population of 5,000,000 of black people distributed over seven of our African Colonies. The Government last week recognised their paramount right to protect a population of 50,000 Chinese in the Transvaal under the suggested constitution of local self government, and if that was the right view to take in regard to the smaller question it must necessarily follow that it was the right view to take with regard to the larger. The Government were now about to give a new Constitution to the Transvaal which no doubt would be followed up by the federation of our South African Colonies. The question was, were we to leave this vast native population to the uncovenanted mercies of the white people who had settled in that country. He was an advocate of self-government, and he wanted freedom in the self-governing Colonies, but while he was in favour of granting self-government to the Colonies he would not grant to the Colonies the freedom to deprive others of their freedom. The whole history of the treatment of backward nations by Europeans was a sad one and contained many pages on which we looked with regret. Under modern civilisation the spirit of adventure had created a class of men who, when they went among uncivilised people, seemed to lose that humane and benevolent relationship which those at home retained. They had been rightly described as prospectors "who belonged to no country and who owned no moral law." He frankly admitted he could not trust the men who under this new system of government would have power over the native races. The Boer record with regard to their treatment of the natives was not a good one; the British record had been no better. Both contained many stories of harshness, cruelty, and encroachments on the rights of natives and of slaughter. Both Boer and Briton believed in the doctrine of freedom, but it was the freedom of the white man to "wollop his own nigger." This country could not, and ought not to, throw off its direct responsibility towards the large native population of South Africa which was denied political rights. They were told recently that the population of the Transvaal approved of Chinese labour. He did not believe it; but if it were true, they had approved of treating human beings as animated machines, of denying them the rights of citizenship, and of denying them their very manhood, and all for the object of obtaining cheap labour and preventing these men from improving their *status* and standard of life. How could we trust those people with the destinies of the vast population to which the Resolution applied? The mine owners had been frank enough in the matter. They openly asked for forced labour and a head tax to compel the men to work. In this country we offered higher wages. As Sir William Harcourt once said—

> "Taxing the poor in order to compel them to labour at work they dislike at a rate of wage far below the market price is, I believe, an economic doctrine purely of South African origin."

Let them not depart from the tradition of this country whose pride it was to vindicate the freedom of labour without any distinction as to colour or race. He appealed to the House not to surrender the control of these millions of helpless, voiceless, voteless people to the tender mercies of the people of the Transvaal. Our responsibility, as Mr. Gladstone had declared, could not be conveniently confided to native Legislatures. That responsibility had been recognised repeatedly by Parliament in connection with Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other Colonies. The Resolution he proposed declared that native populations should have the protecting arm of the State to defend them from prospectors and land-grabbers. Let them learn to have reliance on British love of justice. What was immediately wanted was that in the Transvaal Constitution the prerogative of the Crown as supreme guardian of native interests in South Africa should be fully and emphatically asserted. It was a difficult question which would very soon have to be tackled. Why should a white Government destroy the system of communal land owning, which in many ways was a far better system than the system of the private ownership of land that we had in this country? Why should the happy tribal life of natives be broken up, and why should the native races be forced to labour in the bowels of the earth to dig gold which enriched only a mere handful of speculators? He anticipated the assistance of his Labour colleagues in support of the Resolution, as the rights of labourers at home were all involved in the proper consideration of labour abroad. He appealed to a Government, founded as he believed, on the principles of justice and animated by those principles—he appealed to them both on the grounds of Imperial interest and security, and on the higher moral ground of humanity to shield and shelter the unprotected subjects of the King from the dangers to which they were exposed. He moved.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) seconded the Resolution. He hoped the Government would always remember that it was their duty to watch over the interests of the nation, and to reserve, as he was very glad to hear they were going to do in granting a Constitution to the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, any questions affecting the natives for the consideration of the Home Government. This was very necessary, for he had observed that residence among natives was apt to blunt conceptions of what was right and wrong in their treatment. When he was sent out to South Africa about twenty years ago by Lord Beaconsfield's Government he was supplied with maps on which the north-east corner of Basutoland was marked "Very wild and wooded country, much infested by bushmen." It was their home, their country, the place where they ought to be, and that was like saying that this House was much infested with Members of Parliament. There was a great danger that this view might very often be taken, not only by the War Office, but by private residents in those countries. He thought very highly of the natives of Basutoland, who were most intelligent and advanced. When he first knew the country it was very excellently administered. After Commandant Griffith came one of the ablest servants of the Crown and one of the finest fellows he ever met, Sir M. Clarke. He was not acquainted with Bechuanaland, but he believed Sir H. Goold Adams had exercised a great influence over the country, and it was a pleasure to him to know that the officers of the British Army had risen to the occasion and had turned out most excellent administrators. He happened to be present when the independence of Swaziland was granted, and he was very sorry indeed when it was necessary to take it away. He had that morning received a letter from which he was glad to say it appeared that the future looked much brighter than he had hoped for. Large tracts—about a third of the country—were to be assigned to the natives. He trusted that, whatever Government was in, the duty of safeguarding the natives would always be reserved; that in every Constitution that was granted "no slavery, or apprenticeship partaking of slavery," would be tolerated. These were the words he used during the general election. He regretted there was not in this country the same horror of anything partaking of slavery as there was years ago. He did not think there was the same humanitarian view. He did not believe it was the idea of slavery that exercised the most influence upon the votes at the last election. He thought it was the distinct and specific promises that were made to the British working men in 1900. He well remembered that the military governor of Johannesburg just before the end of the war promised openly that as soon as the war was over the country would be open to British workmen, and that Lord Roberts promised those who fought in the war that they should have the first chance of employment. The feeling of working men that they had been deceived had most effect at the recent election. He earnestly hoped that we should return to those feelings which animated the Wilberforces and the Clarksons, and the other great workers for freedom, and thus continue to safeguard the honour of the British nation.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That in any settlement of South African affairs, this House desires a recognition of Imperial responsibility for the protection of all races excluded from equal political rights, the safeguarding of all immigrants against servile conditions of labour, and the guarantee to the native populations of at least their existing status, with the unbroken possession of their liberties in Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and other tribal countries and reservations."—(*Mr. Byles.*)

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) supported the Resolution. He felt strongly that in recent discussions on South African matters the very deep interest which the great majority of Members felt in the right treatment of the natives of South Africa, no less than for the right treatment of the Chinese, was not perhaps adequately set forth, and that it was of extreme importance that it should now be fully expressed. The principle of the protection of the natives for which the Resolution contended involved looking after two things—the physical well-being of the natives and their moral well-being. That raised first of all the general question of the principle on which we should supervise the life of the more backward races over which we had control. It was very commonly held as a condition of the well-being of any nation that its political development should be sequent and continuous. We were often taught in this country that we had a great advantage or superiority over other countries in that our political development had this continuity, while that of other countries had been spasmodic. We were told how very much more wholesome was the political progress of this country than that of France, which had moved by more or less sudden steps; and yet the men who applauded this commonplace, when they had any power over the so-called lower races, were found ready to tear those races up by the roots, to make an end suddenly of the system of tribal law, and to impose upon them all at once the methods of a superior race. That had been done in South Africa as everywhere else where the white race, who called itself superior, had power over the black race, or, as it was called, the lower race. Unhappily there had never been in the whole history of mankind an instance of a civilised race taking anything like a scientific, much less a humane, method of treating the native question, which seemed always to be settled by the passion, pride, and prejudice of race. There was a special danger in South Africa in view of the Constitution about to be given to the Transvaal. In the Transvaal there were political elements which augured worse for the well-being of the native races than could be said perhaps of any elements in the other Colonies. When he was at Cape Town in 1900 he saw many exiles from Johannesburg—" helots " was the word the year before—and he was much and frequently struck by the peculiarly insolent and violent tone taken up by the Johannesburg exiles in regard to the natives. It was a matter of exasperation to them that the natives in Cape Town had some semblance of human rights. If these men had any power in the administration of the new Constitution there was the greatest danger of their using that power for the unjust treatment of the natives, from which it was our duty to protect them. He knew they would be told, as they were always told at such a juncture, that it was our duty to leave these gentlemen, after giving them a Constitution, to manage things for themselves; but it had to be remembered that if these men found themselves in any military difficulty they would once more call for the employment of the whole forces of the Empire to safeguard their interests, and it was the duty of this country to see that the forces of the Empire should be applied for the preservation of what were considered to be the principles of civilisation. There could be no question that with regard to the South African War, the promise and the desire to better the condition of the natives was a motive that told greatly with many people in this country. Lord Lansdowne, amongst others, including many of the clergy—and he believed most conscientiously—spoke at the time of the conditions of native life in the Transvaal as particularly bad, and looked forward to an improvement of those conditions as the great boon that was to come from the war. Some of the charges made in that connection he held to be unjust. He agreed that the record of the Boers towards the natives was far from clear. He thought there had been guilt on their part, as on the part of all white races coming into contact with other races. He had heard an admission from the Boers themselves that their own calamities opened their eyes in respect of their treatment of the natives, and that they had become conscious of some guilt on their part towards others. But in so far as the charge was violently pressed on our side against them in the course of the war, he thought that it was grossly exaggerated. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham before the war spoke of the treatment of the natives by the Boers as being brutal and disgraceful; after the right hon. Gentleman came home from South Africa after the war he withdrew the charge. In the meantime, however, the war had been made largely upon that charge, and if the right hon. Gentleman's conscience was clear in the matter after his retraction so much the better for his peace of mind. It was quite clear that, whatever were the errors or delusions of people in this country with regard to our going into the war, we were morally obliged to do something for the native races. We were always, in fact, pledged in that way. The Transvaal Convention set forth what was undoubtedly then the sincere desire of people of this country —that anything approaching slavery should be prohibited under even what was called suzerainty at that time. It was this that had done so much to bring upon this country the repute for hypocrisy which it enjoyed in the eyes of Continental nations. He believed it happened in this country that humane, public-spirited Governments laid down certain provisions which they were anxious to carry out, and these Governments were followed by others who showed no such anxiety; and the total action of the country was credited to the insincerity of the race. This country was pledged to do something for the natives, and, after all the other pretences on which the war had been made had been cast to the winds or openly trodden under foot, the question was whether this promise was to be trodden under foot also. Were we to have any justification in the eyes of the world for that infamous and disastrous war? He was certain that the Government would never consent to any action which would lead to a breach of this promise. But how was the promise to be kept? The question had to be asked, What kind of life was really best for the natives? In the year 1900 there were many views set forth by the promoters of the war as to what life was best for the natives. One common view of the gentlemen of Johannesburg was that the best thing for the native was to force him to work in the gold mines for nine months and to live in a compound, at the end of which time he would make enough money to go back to his kraal, buy three wives, and do no work ever afterwards. When a little later the cue was to complain of the high wages the natives got, the tendency of the native to do that sort of thing was urged by the same gentlemen against the employment of the native. The gentlemen who ran the interests of Johannesburg had never given the slightest scientific consideration to what was really best for the natives. The assumption was made that we must take such legislative measures as would make the native do more work—that was, for the white man. The House heard a great deal about the dignity of labour in this connection. Some one had remarked concerning a celebrated writer that he had a great hunger and thirst after righteousness in others, and it was so with those who talked so much in Johannesburg about the dignity of labour. But he believed a great deal of misrepresentation was embodied in the account which had been given of the native in South Africa in respect of his disinclination to labour. They were told that the native was indolent, that he lived in perpetual sunshine, and therefore life must be made harder for him in order that he should learn the dignity of labour. If any such conditions prevailed elsewhere in the world they did not prevail in South Africa. It was not easy to make a living by hand labour in a land scourged by plagues. The native of South Africa was, properly, an agriculturist and was not well fitted for work in the mines; and it was not the business of Parliament either to force the natives of South Africa or of any other land into the mines. If there was a shortage of labour in the mines it was a calamity that ought to be borne by the gentlemen who owned the mines. Mining life for the natives was an extremely bad life in two ways. The death rate which it caused amongst natives was simply appalling, and it was particularly dreadful when natives were brought, as a number of them were, from Central Africa. There was a death rate of over 200 per 1,000 among workers in the mines from Central Africa. The mortality in the mines which were marked "good" particularly called for the attention and intervention of the authorities. There could be no doubt that the introduction of thousands of natives to work in the mines had been the means of spreading deadly disease throughout the whole native races of South Africa. It was always in the diamond or gold mining industry that the lowest and most degrading conditions of labour prevailed. The assumption made was that there was a kind of irresistible need to develop gold mining *ad libitum*, and that towards that end almost any measure was necessary. He suggested that the main industry of Johannesburg, or, at any rate, that which most moved the politics of South Africa, was not so much the sinking of gold mines, as the floating of them. It was this eternal purpose of the flotation of unnecessary gold mines that underlay the whole of the perpetual demand for labour, and it was the real cause of the South African War. It was, however, as much an orthodox doctrine of political economy now as it was fifty years ago that gold-mining was not an industry which was important to civilisation at all. Coal mines were of far more value to mankind. The richest country in the world contrived to get along with almost no gold currency. The main consideration as to gold was its æsthetic value. He contended that whatever measure the Legislature adopted it should not imperil the welfare of large numbers of human beings. But he denied that it could be for a moment the duty of any Legislature or Government to encourage or support the efforts of men who regarded gold-mining as a great industry because it was one that enriched them. It did not add to the wealth of the world, but only to the riches of individuals, and the duty of the Government was surely to see to the development of the real industry of South Africa, which was agriculture. By common consent gold-mining was a transient industry at the best, and the part gold-mining was now playing in South Africa was something like this: it slew tens of thousands of natives, demoralised natives by the hundred thousand, sowed among them the seeds of far-reaching diseases, and left them to begin a new life on a lower scale of civilisation. It was a common phrase in South Africa to hear it said that "a Kaffir civilised is a Kaffir spoiled." It was also remarked that the Kaffir who went into a town lost his own virtues and acquired the vices of the white man without the white man's virtues. What those particular virtues were that were thus missed by the Kaffir he could never clearly ascertain, but it was certain, by the admission of British colonists, that the Kaffir in his kraal was honest, honourable, and industrious, and if by the admission of our own colonists the species of so-called pseudo-industrial civilisation we were putting up made the Kaffir cease to have those virtues it was the duty of this House to take into consideration the means by which they might, even at the risk of arresting the development of the gold mines, save this race for the civilisation of the future. As between Boers and British, he thought the Boer had the better record of the two regarding the treatment of natives, especially if we included in the British record the wholesale demoralisation of natives in the mines. When in Natal in the year 1900 he met a number of Zulus who did not speak English, but whose language was interpreted for him by the Misses Colenso, whose beneficent sway amongst the Zulus was one of the most beautiful things to be witnessed in South Africa. He tried to get from them their own opinion as to the relative merits of life under the Boers and under the British, and none of them had been at the mines. After a very interesting discussion, in which those Zulus showed as high a capacity for judging their own interests and looking after their own affairs as they would find in the peasantry of any other race, he gathered that they had come to the conclusion that it was better for them to be under a Dutch master, because the Dutch master, though he did not give them high wages or money wages at all, gave them stock, and thus made them small farmers, whilst the British farmer paid fairly high money wages, but got a good deal of the money back in fines. So that from the Zulu point of view the native was really better off under a Dutch master than under an English master. There was no question of physical ill-usage, and this was specially important in this connection. But it was beyond question that there had been flogging and ill-usage of natives as well as Chinese in the mines. It was very difficult to put a stop to that kind of thing. There seemed to be an idea that the white man best showed his superiority over the black by treating the latter as he would treat a dangerous beast. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."]

MR. FIENNES (Oxfordshire, Banbury): I have lived in South Africa a considerable number of years and I deny that.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON said a readiness to kick the native was common among colonists, and if a man demurred to that sort of thing he was constantly told that if he lived there six months he would adopt the views of other people. If he had been told that once, he had been told it fifty times by our own colonists. It was necessary that in the Constitution of the Transvaal measures should be taken to protect the natives from flogging and ill-usage in the mines. The main cause of the native unrest in Natal was the imposition of a poll-tax, the object of which was to force the natives to work either for smaller wages than they would otherwise get or at a kind of labour which they would not otherwise do. It was no part of their business to force native labour into the hands of capitalists. They were told that it was their duty to give the native higher needs, and that the way to give him higher needs was to tax him and make it more difficult for him to live. The true way was to educate him, but when they proposed to do this in Natal, nine men out of every ten would say it must not be done, and that they dare not do it, because that would turn out the white man. What a confession! It would be quite impossible to enforce anything like a system of proper native education in Natal, but might he suggest that it should be part of the business of the Government to give facilities for the education of natives under the new Transvaal Constitution. If this was not done, they made to the world the confession that this Empire rested upon the degradation of human life, even if they got rid altogether of Chinese labour, which was only one phase of this eternal process of degradation of life wherever capital ruled civilisation. It was a common thing to work gold mines by means of forced or servile labour. Whether they called it slavery or not the result of it was just the same. It was the same in ancient Egypt and in Rome. There was an impression that the working of gold mines by slave labour was the way to enrich a great nation, but it was just this mistaken notion which brought ruin upon Spain. Had it been the misfortune of this country to have acquired the mines in the New World which were obtained by Spain he had no doubt that all the deterioration and the financial and industrial decay which overtook Spain would have overtaken this country in exactly the same way. They had suffered enough by this tendency and this process. They had not noticed this deterioration so much because they had a healthy active industry at home; but he thought that hon. Members would agree with him when he said that they could not carry on such practices even on the fringes of their Empire without a dangerous reaction setting in. They looked to the Government to stand up for the dignity of humanity and the rights of all men. A Johannesburg capitalist, speaking of the danger of an influx of trade unionism and of the acquisition of power in governing the Transvaal by white workmen, said that he desired that the more intellectual section of the community should govern the country. They all desired that the more intellectual section of the country should govern, in so far as it could govern in these matters, and that intellectual section was not to be found among the promoters of a ruinous and destructive capitalistic civilisation in the Transvaal.

*MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) said that for two years after the war he was resident magistrate in one of the largest districts of the Transvaal, and he therefore claimed to know something of the people. During those two years he never saw a Kaffir ill-treated in any way whatever. It struck him that this ill-treatment of the Kaffirs was one of those South African tall stories which were so often told. It was impossible to live among the Boers and country people in the Transvaal as he done and not to like and respect them. He resented, as the colonists of the Transvaal themselves would resent, the imputations which the Motion put upon them; Their best men were as good as our best men, and the average level of their civilisation was not lower than ours—it was higher. They were just as capable of humane feelings. But beside this the hon. Member was advancing a very curious doctrine. This native problem was the question of all questions which most interested the people of South Africa. It was with them from the cradle to the grave, and it was the thing that affected them more intimately than anything else. This Motion was unnecessary and irritating because our fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal were humane and reasonable people, and also because we could not possibly know so much here as they did about the question. But there was another reason. He believed it to be an impolitic Motion altogether. These Colonials objected more than anything else to being dictated to and "bossed by" anybody else. The very fact that any measure was being urged forward by the home Government was sufficient to send a great number of South Africans into the opposite camp. Especially was this the case in regard to the question of the treatment of natives. Those who had read Mr. Theale's history of South Africa would remember that it was shown that it was the interference of the missionary Philip and the fact that he had the ear of the Government at home that produced the Great Trek of 1836. South Africans were in many respects very much like the old French nobility, for they forgot nothing. If we advocated that the British Government should have the right to interfere in regard to this question, then we should unite against the Government not only the Afrikander but the new settler, not only the English but the Dutch. When we had done this, the only thing left for the Government to do would be to climb down, because the colonists would tell them in unmistakable language to go and mind their own business. Hon. Gentlemen might think that this Motion would give us some sort of handle with which to expel the Chinamen from South Africa; but he thought the Government might find a better handle. He himself looked to the establishment of a Labour Party on the Rand for a handle, but this was certainly the worst that could be used. His friends in South Africa had a very lukewarm interest indeed in Chinese labour, for they did not come into contact with the Celestial and they neither benefited nor suffered by his presence. But there were questions affecting native government which did affect his friends, and one was the question of Swaziland, and another whether Indian traders and storekeepers should be allowed to compete with white traders. Such questions as those were of the utmost importance to the people of South Africa. He was not present, however, to explain those questions, although he believed that he could make out a fairly good case for colonial opinion. The point was, that the vast mass of colonial opinion was in favour of one certain line of action, and if Parliament put itself to thwart the views of colonials on these questions they were laying up for themselves a very evil future. If we gave responsible government to the Transvaal—and he was thankful that the Government were going to do so—let it be full responsible government, and let them trust their fellow-countrymen. He wanted to see as wide an electorate as possible. Every adult white man should have a vote, and he wished one vote to have one value, so that the men of our own race with their unfortunately small families might have as good a chance as possible. He did not want to see a mere travesty of responsible government. Every Afrikander, every man of our own race, if we interfered with their wishes and pressed home the views of this country in opposition to their views, would give us only one answer, which it would not be Parliamentary to state, but which began with the words "Go to——." And they would be quite right too, because if we were going to trust them we should trust them altogether.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he thought that most moderate men would be grateful for the speech to which they had just listened. Whatever might be thought upon the question generally, the evidence given by a man who knew the country of which he spoke and who had had the practical experience of the hon. Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme must always command respect and attention. When he first read this Motion he thought that on the whole he could agree with it in most of its terms. There was, however, one phrase in the Motion which was intended to have an effect upon the action of the Government in regard to the question of Chinese labour, but the other terms of the Motion should command their attention, and be the subjects upon which the House decided to-night whether there was a division or not. He wished to say a word in corroboration of what the hon. Member opposite had said in regard to the Boer and British population and the attitude of the people of the Transvaal, the Orange River Colony, and the other Colonies in South Africa. Of course it was an easy thing to say that the colonists would resent any action of the Imperial Legislature. He had had a great deal of experience of the Colonies and he ventured to say that the Colonial Legislatures would listen with respect and deference to the views of the Imperial Legislature if those views were put forward temperately and moderately, and without the acrimony of Party controversy behind them. That was the kind of thing of which the colonists complained, for they did not like questions of this kind being made subjects of Party controversy. He thought that behind the speech of the hon. Member for Tyneside there ran all through a tone of acrimony against the past Government—[Cries of "No, no!"]—and he based the burden of his charge upon the late war for which he held the late Government responsible. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear!"] They accepted the responsibility, but the war was thrust upon them. ["Oh, oh!"] Yes, it was forced upon them by the ultimatum of President Kruger. ["Oh, oh!"] They accepted full responsibility for the war, and they were ready to defend the action which they took. What they quarrelled with was the statement made by the hon. Member that it was an infamous war. ["It was."] All he could say was that the late Parliament, by a large majority of its Members, did not characterise that war as an infamous one. [AN HON. MEMBER: And where are they now?] Hon. Members opposite had been permitted to make violent charges which were uncalled for without a single dissentient voice from the Opposition, but when he made an attempt to defend the position taken by the late Government he was treated by hon. Members opposite as though he were uttering sentiments unworthy of a man who held honest convictions. ["No, no!"] The hon. Member below the gangway had said that gold mining was practically unnecessary in the development of the commerce and industry of the world. He commended that statement to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He commended it also to the people responsible for the finances of this country and to all those who understood what commerce and finance were in this or any other country. The hon. Member said that life in gold mines was always demoralising and degrading, but he would challenge that statement from first to last. He challenged the hon. Member for Tyneside to assert that life in the mines of Australia and the United States was degrading, and contended that, after the first stage of development, the life in mines settled down into the ordinary occupation of making money and providing a product from raw material for the needs of the country and of the world, which was exactly the same as that coming from any other industry. It had been said that it would be dangerous to give to the new Colonies the control of the natives. It had been suggested that the Commission on Native Affairs which sat from 1903 and reported in 1905 was a packed Commission. Would any hon. Member who looked at the names of the Commissioners and who had read their Report characterise it as a packed Commission? The Commission included Mr. Sloley, the Acting Commissioner for Basutoland, Mr. Marshall Campbell of Natal, who was an expert authority on native affairs, and Colonel Sandford. The statement that it was a packed Commission would not stand the test of any investigation whatever. There were also on the Commission a gentleman from Cape Colony, two gentlemen from Natal, one from the Orange River Colony, one from the Transvaal, and one from Rhodesia. All these gentlemen gave their decision on the evidence presented to them. All of them represented in their separate communities as much uprightness and respect as could be given to any body of men by their fellow-citizens. Their judgment, as stated in a summary of the Report which he would quote, was not in favour of the breaking up of the communal system. Their judgment was that—

> "The time has arrived when locations and reserves should be defined, delimited, and reserved for natives by legislative enactment."

What more did the hon. Gentleman want? Further the Commissioners said—

> "This should be done with a view to finality in the provision of land for the native population, and thereafter no more land should be reserved for native occupation. The purchase and leasing of land by natives should in future be limited to a certain area to be defined by legislative enactment, with a view to preventing them from coming into conflict with European landowners. Unrestrained squatting on private farms is deprecated, and it is recommended that no native other than *bona-fide* servants of the occupier, with their families, should be permitted to live on private lands except under Government sanction and control."

Could any conclusions more meet the expressed views of the mover and seconder of the Motion than those arrived at by that Commission? What conclusion did the Commission come to as to labour?—

> "The remedies suggested are the checking of the practice of squatting, the imposition of a tax on locations based on the number of able-bodied natives domiciled therein, the imposition of a rent on natives living on Crown lands, the encouragement of a high standard among

Sir Gilbert Parker.

natives by giving support to education as well as to industrial and manual training. It further recommends direct taxation by means of a poll or hut tax of not less than £1 a year in any colony, farm servants in continuous employment being exempted."

We were to give the natives protection under new conditions and opportunities for being civilised. Did the hon. Member object to the native being taxed in order to obtain the protection which secured him the benefits of education and gave him opportunities for development he would not otherwise possess ?]

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Civilisation by taxation.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Yes, civilisation by taxation.

MR. FLAVIN: And by "compounding" them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he wondered whether there ever had been a development from barbarism to civilisation and the higher forms of life without giving to the individual who was developed some sort of civic responsibility. It was that sort of civic responsibility which every Government in South Africa proposed in connection with the development of the natives. The mover of the Motion suggested that the natives should be on an exact equality with other races. The natives were in such a position morally, and they should be put in such a position legally, but not until they had placed themselves in a position to be so regarded. In a pamphlet published by Theophilus Schreiner in 1901 in regard to the question of what should be the future of the natives of the Transvaal, Natal, and other colonies, the writer quoted the following statement made in the name of the Home Government by Sir Alfred Milner and Lord Kitchener to Commandant Botha in connection with the peace negotiations—

"As regards the extension of the franchise to Kaffirs in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to give such franchise before representative government is granted to these colonies, and if then given, it will be so limited as to secure the just predominance of the white races. The legal position of coloured persons will, however, be similar to that which they hold in the Cape Colony."

In the same pamphlet Mr. Schreiner also quoted the following words used by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the communication which fixed these terms—

"We cannot consent to purchase peace by leaving the coloured population in the position in which they stood before the war, with not even the ordinary civil rights which the Government of the Cape Colony has long conceded to them."

Commenting on these declarations Mr. Schreiner said—

"These are noble words, worthy of the highest moral prestige of England, at any time in her history, and they give one the assurance that England will not fail to do the right with regard to the important question under discussion."

If the hon. Gentleman opposite accepted Mr. Schreiner as an authority on one side of the question would he accept him on the other also ? It had been stated here to-night that we were all brothers. He approved of the definition of the Australian who, on being challenged by a certain Free Church minister as to his willingness to accept a native as a brother said, "Yes, I will accept him as a brother, but I will not accept him as a brother-in-law." Beneath that answer lay the secret of the whole question. If the native was to be civilised some degree of civic responsibility was essential; and his moral equality with the white could not be admitted until he was able to take his part in the development of the country in which he was protected. He did not say that the Kaffir could not be educated; but, if he were placed in a position in which he would have absolute responsibility for the development of national or civic life along lines we believed to be civilised, the Government must break down. The education of the native must be a matter of great patience, great care, and great solicitude. What he required more than anything else was training in artisan labour. Therein lay the secret of the development of these races if they were to be developed along the lines which we believed would make them civilised citizens, and that would require a very long period of instruction. He believed that most Members of the House would be willing that the existing system in South Africa should remain, under which the High Commissioner had absolute control of the final application to the natives of all laws passed by the Legislature.

This much-abused packed Commission had been so democratic as to suggest that the natives should have representatives in the Parliaments of the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal, and that these natives should be, as it were, an electorate by themselves to choose representatives for the discussion of their own affairs in those Legislatures. If that Commission could give a judgment so democratic as that, would not the House treat their conclusions with respect and deference? He defied the House to read the judgments of this Commission without being impressed by the anxiety on the part of right-minded men to find a solution of a problem which lay so close to the hearts of South Africans. This Ethiopian movement in South Africa did not spring from the hut tax, but was an attempt to teach the 6,000,000 of Africans as against the 1,000,000 odd of whites, that South Africa was theirs. Did any sensible man contend that South Africa, its industries and its resources, all belonged to the native races? It belonged to civilisation, and it was the duty of civilisation to show the native of the land that he had never used its illimitable resources. In Canada, the United States, Australia, and elsewhere, the natives were being taught that the land in which they lived should be improved and developed exactly as they themselves were being taught and developed. That development could only take place through the wise and non-tyrannous dominance of a white race like our own. He appealed to hon. Members to take a temperate view of this matter and not to associate this movement with the question of the development of the mines. He did not believe that the present Government would do otherwise than take a sane view of this matter, and give to the Legislatures of the colonies independence on the question of the natives, reserving for the Imperial authority power to supervise.

* THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The hon. Member who has just sat down has urged us to discuss this matter in a temperate spirit, and, having listened to the whole of this debate, I am bound to say that I have rarely heard a debate conducted with more harmony and moderation. Certainly I shall not be the first to introduce any element of disagreement. His Majesty's Government will not resist the Motion of my hon. friend, but, on the contrary, we shall gladly further his wish to inscribe it in the journals of the House. We accept fully the proposition that there is an Imperial responsibility for the protection of native races not represented in legislative assemblies, and I have in former times, not so long ago, joined with my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool to assert, as I hope it may always be in my power to assert, the right of any British subject of any race, or any colour, however humble may be his position and however distant the land in which he dwells, to the sympathy and respect of the House of Commons. Taking the second proposition in the Resolution, we have said more than once in both Houses of Parliament that while in regard to the labour conditions in South Africa we are prepared to leave in the hands of the local legislatures all the social, political, and financial considerations, the Imperial Parliament must be consulted in regard to anything which raises moral consideration; and it has been asserted that we shall use the veto of the Crown without hesitation in respect to any legislation which we consider infringes the fundamental principles of British liberty. The third proposition of the Resolution is that to the natives of South Africa should be secured at least their existing status and the maintenance of those reservations in which they are permitted to dwell under their own tribal regulations. That shall be the unceasing care of His Majesty's Government so long as it is represented by its present members.

Let me look for a moment at some of the colonies in South Africa. In Cape Colony the natives are enfranchised, and although I do not pretend that there are no questions at issue between black and white, yet broadly, it may be said that the natives in Cape Colony have machinery at their disposal for making their voices heard. As to Natal, I will say something a little more in detail before I sit down. Bechuanaland and Basutoland are practically and virtually independent provinces under the special protection of the British Crown, administered by the High Commissioner; and let the House be quite assured that there is no intention of derogating in the slightest degree from the position that they at present occupy. Lord Selborne has in the last few days visited Basutoland—which I think is a rare thing, though not an unprecedented thing, for the High Commissioner to do—and I think that his sympathy and interest in the natives of Basutoland cannot but be advanced by the close personal contact into which he has come with their headmen and the paramount chief. In regard to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, to some extent our hands are tied because, as the House well knows, by the terms of the surrender at Vereeniging we agreed with the Boers that no franchise should be extended to the natives of the country until self-government had been granted. At question time my hon. friend the Member for Preston asked whether "natives" included the natives of India. According to the strict interpretations of language the agreement would not include the natives of India; but, according to the general acceptance of the term, "natives" have been taken in many regulations, ordinances, and statutes to include all men of colour belonging to Africa, Asia, or America.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): May I ask whether that is the definition of the word "native" which is given in the report of the South African Natives Commission?

*MR. CHURCHILL: I will not quarrel with my hon. friend on a matter of definition or interpretation. I think we are all agreed that we must avoid anything that would be regarded as a breach of faith by those men who fought in the war with such great pertinacity and courage, and nothing would more embitter our relations or embarrass our prospects in future if they had it in their power to say that we had availed ourselves of any strictly legal interpretation to avoid carrying out the conditions of the treaty. We have said that we will reserve and give instructions that there should be reserved and set up special machinery for reserving all questions in which the treatment of the native is to be differentiated from the treatment of Europeans living in the country. The Government are furthermore considering the question of reserving an annual sum of money for the administration of native affairs. The principle of making these reservations in the formation of a constitution is a very clearly established principle in our Colonial system. In the constitution of Western Australia, alluded to by my hon. friend, there is reserved a grant of £5,000 a year, but the Government of West Australia spends a great deal more than that on the education of the natives. There is a reservation in Natal of £10,000 concerning the administration of which I shall have something to say presently. The Commonwealth Parliament of Australia has imitated us by making a similar reservation in the case of New Guinea. I do not wish to anticipate the general statement that will be made, I hope, during the course of the session on the constitutions which will be given to the Transvaal and Orange River Colony; but I say, with every desire to attach significance to my words, that the principle of reserving a definite sum for the special interests of natives and for the maintenance of a native department is one which is receiving earnest attention, and will, I have every reason to believe, issue in accomplished fact. There only remains the question of Swaziland. That is a case in which independence did not produce the good results one might have hoped would have followed from the gift. The King of Swaziland, like other persons prominently connected with South Africa, showed himself profligate with the resources of his people; and in the course of a few years he managed to hand over to concession hunters almost every available source of revenue. The conditions we have found in Swaziland were such as promised no stability whatever. The natives obtained the bare right of living on the land, but concessionnaires everywhere had superior rights of grazing and mining over the same land. A Commission has been at work with the object of terminating this dual and conflicting ownership of the land, and ascertaining once for all what belongs to the natives, and giving them that absolutely for their exclusive use, and ascertaining what in law as recognised by the late Government of the Transvaal, and consequently by us, belongs to the concessionaires. An area of 154,000 acres has been mentioned as the quantity of land which will be allocated to the native. I am informed, however, that certainly not less than 1,000,000 out of a total of 3,000,000 acres in the country will be so allocated Any opportunity of justly increasing the proportion in favour of the native which may present itself will be eagerly seized upon.

Turning to the more general subject of debate I would venture to draw a distinction between harsh customs which we dislike and positive cruelty. Positive cruelty requires on all occasions the severe and stern condemnation of this House, and I do not think we should be deterred from speaking our minds by any fear of Colonial susceptibilities. All forms of cruelty to natives are to be reprobated, but there is one form of cruelty which is especially odious; it is when it takes the form of the exploitation of natives for the purpose of gain. In any such cases it should be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government will do all in their power—perhaps will run the risk of attempting something beyond their power—to bring the opinion of the House to bear upon those concerned. For my part regarding as I do all taxation as an evil, I am certainly not prepared to support any system of taxation which, apart from the general purpose of raising revenue for the service of the country, has for its object the intention of forcing natives to do work which, under ordinary economic conditions, they would not have chosen to do, and which no machinery exists to force them to do. The late High Commissioner in South Africa, Lord Milner, was a statesman of fine professions. I do not think anybody could have expressed more clearly and more cogently what I think would be the view of the House to-night upon this subject than Lord Milner. He says—

> "The essence of wisdom with regard to the coloured question is discrimination—not to throw all people of colour, the highest as well as the lowest, into one indistinguishable heap, but to follow closely the differences of race, of circumstances, and of degress of civilisation, and to adapt your policy intelligently to the several requirements of each."

There is very often a great deal of difference between profession and performance. I make no charges against Lord Milner's humanity. It is quite true that within the past few days he has come forward into the political arena as a Party politician. [OPPOSITION cries of "No!"], and he cannot be said to be any longer under the ægis of the great Department which he served for so long. I should not myself be anxious to be forward in attacking him; but I tell the House most frankly that certainly, as far as I am concerned—and I think I speak for others who sit here—I should not put myself to any undue or excessive exertion to defend Lord Milner from any attacks which might be made upon him. Lord Milner's position in regard to the native question in South Africa is necessarily a very weak one. Being regarded after the war as the inveterate enemy of the Dutch, as the prime author of all their miseries, he had to fall back for his support upon the British section of the population, and upon that particular British section of the population which is called the mine-owning group. In order to placate the mine-owning group, he had somewhat to ignore the interests of the British population. In order to propitiate the British population he had to sacrifice the interests of the Dutch, and in order to compensate the mine-owners, British and Dutch, for these disadvantages he had to sacrifice the interests of the natives. His fine proclamation, which was to have enabled all respectable men of colour to be relieved from the objectionable regulations and provisions of the law, and which was to have established the principle of equal rights for all civilised men, irrespective of colour or creed, from the Cape to the Zambesi, under his administration, resulted in the fact that in the Transvaal only fifteen gentlemen of colour were exempted from the provisions of the ordinary law; and it was left to my noble friend Lord Elgin to apply the provisions of this proclamation to the Orange River Colony. That has been done within the course of the present year. In addition, under Lord Milner, largely increased taxation was levied on the natives of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, and although it is quite true to say that the use of the lash was largely diminished, it is necessary to observe that the diminution in the use of the lash was mainly due to the exertions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and not by any means to the exertions of the distinguished representative of the King's authority in that part of the world.

I will not speak at any length of the motives and principles which have led my hon. friend to bring forward this Resolution. They are motives and principles which are perfectly appropriate when expressed by the representative of a district not altogether unconnected with Manchester. He has that wide sympathy with all native races which has always been one of the noblest characteristics of the old Manchester school. I was reading an entertaining essay by an American author the other day, which I think expresses in the fullest and most complete form the motives which have influenced my hon. friend. If the House will pardon me I will read an extract from it—

> "The Deity that suffers us, we may be sure, can suffer many another queer and wondrous and only half delightful thing. . . . The inner significance of other lives exceeds all our powers of sympathy and insight. If we feel a significance in our own life which would lead us spontaneously to claim its perpetuity, let us be at least tolerant of like claims made by other lives, however numerous, however unideal they may seem to us to be."

I would remind the House that this philosophical observation is sustained by an extract from the report of the Committee on Native Labour in South Africa, which was quoted some years ago in letters, widely published, by the late Sir William Harcourt, whose active and vigilant humanity led him to champion the cause of those whom he thought had no other protector than an eminent Member of Parliament.

> "Not alone,

he said—

> "does the native labour assiduously at cultivating his wives' fields, but the young men migrate in their thousands to the mines. Statistics prove these natives, and more especially the Fingoes, to be by far the most industrious people in South Africa. In fact, the native supports the whole economic fabric on his depised and dusky back. It is he that has built our railways; without him the working of our mines would be impossible."

Now, sir, I have endeavoured to state the general principles which have influenced the action of my hon. friend. But let me also ask the attention of the House while I remark that there are several limitations which must in practice be observed. I hope the House will not think me disrespectful or sneering when I say that we must not forget that, in regard to this native question our principles and sympathies entail no positive sacrifice upon us. Whatever standard we may set up, however lofty it is, it costs us no inconvenience. We may set up the most lofty standard; it is other people who have to live up to it. I do not suggest that for that reason we should lower the standard of our professions. But that fact emphasizes the necessity for caution in applying our principles to the existing circumstances of the case in the Colonies with which we have to deal. I now ask the House to face other considerations. There are many things in the laws of the colonial Governments which frankly we do not like. We do not approve of them, and we wish they were not there. There are, for instance, provisions which exclude the natives from walking on the footpath in a town, which offend against our sense of democratic equality. But harsh laws are sometimes better than no laws at all, and unless we carry public opinion with us in procuring the removal of any of these objectionable provisions the result would only be their lawless assertion, which, I believe, would impose more injustice and tyranny on the natives than the regulated assertion which is contained in a statute of law. The second limitation on our action, is of course, the great principle of self-government. Self-government is not a moral principle, and when it comes into collision with moral principles I think upon occasion it should be over-borne. But self-government is a fundamental maxim of Liberal colonial policy. It is the master-key of many of the problems which embarrass and perplex us. The responsible government of a Colony is a great gift: it is, I think, the greatest and best gift that we can bestow—the bestowal of Home Rule upon a distant community, to live their own life in their own way, to develop their own civilisation according to their own ideals, through the agency of a representative Legislative Assembly and an Executive responsible thereto. It sounds familiar, does it not?

It is one of the most precious gifts we can bestow; but it is a gift that can only be bestowed once. Once it has been given, it is not good to grudge it, and it is impossible to limit or restrict it. It is with these two limitations in mind that I would ask the House to survey the more general considerations which we have to entertain to-night. We have in the British Empire numbers of native States and Dependencies where there are native questions and racial questions of great complexity. All are governed by peculiar conditions. Every one differs markedly from the other. Having regard to all these conditions, our power of intervention varies greatly. In some cases we have great and overwhelming power of intervention, in other cases we have hardly any power of intervention at all. I submit respectfully to the House as a general principle that our responsibility in this matter is directly proportionate to our power. Where there is great power there is great responsibility, where there is less power there is less responsibility, and where there is no power there can, I think, be no responsibility. It is on that general foundation that I approach the questions connected with South Africa. Let me remark that Parliamentary interest in the native question ought not to be confined to South Africa. There are many other countries where things are done which require vigilant attention. But we know more about South Africa than about any other Colony for three reasons—because we have had great wars there, because we have paid more for it, and because a large military force is maintained there, and has been maintained there in the past partly with the avowed intention of redressing the disproportion between the numbers of natives and of European settlers. Therefore in South Africa, above all other Colonies, we are provided with a most sure foothold for intervention in behalf of the natives. We have greater power and therefore greater responsibility. A self-governing Colony is not entitled to say one day, "Hands off; no dictation in our internal affairs," and the next day to telegraph for the protection of a brigade of British infantry. But if we have special duties in South Africa, the circumstances of the time impose upon us an extra degree of caution. Although it is the Colony in which we have the greatest power to intervene, it is also a Colony the most unhappy, the most vexed and torn, and in a highly sensitive condition. The ordeal through which South Africa has passed must not be forgotten. We talk of the heavy cost of the war, of £240,000,000 paid by us, to which South Africa has contributed nothing. But, Sir, the sufferings of South Africa have been such as no Treasury account could equate. Disaster and ruined homes, wrecked railways and three years cut from the free life of every South African under the harsh infliction of martial law, a dislocated social organisation, a devastated countryside—that is the contribution South Africa has made to the tragedy of the last few years.

The native question, everywhere deserving attention, has in Natal assumed certain features which give ground for legitimate anxiety. That the Colony is acutely apprehensive may be judged from the fact that because two policemen have been killed the whole Colony has been placed under martial law, all the local forces are mobilised, and a censorship has been established over the cable. But the danger is now lessened. Prompt action has, I think, prevented a native rising. And let us not once forget that all native risings begin with the massacre of a few lonely whites and end in a butchery of many blacks. The Natal Government are anxious that a battalion of troops should be sent to Pietermaritzburg to meet any emergency, and they offer to contribute £6,000 a year towards the cost. The House will consider whether that is altogether unreasonable. I confess that, personally, having marched and wandered over a considerable part of the beautiful grassy undulations of Natal, and having mingled a little with Natalians, I have considerable respect and affection for them. Perhaps the Natal Government has not shown as much liberality towards the natives as they might have done. I do not think £8,650 a year for educating the natives is very lavish. But I hope we may be able in future years by any leverage which may be open to us to secure a greater proportion of money to be devoted to native education and to the general amelioration of the condition of the natives in Natal. On the whole, however, the natives in Natal have been a very happy people. They have increased greatly in numbers by immigration as well as by births. The positive occasion of the manifestation of discontent just witnessed has been the collection of the poll-tax. That has been the provocation, but the real causes lie deeper, than the immediate cause of discontent. The poll-tax is a tax to which every one, I think, would have objections in principle. It seems absurd, on the face of it, to tax the poor native at the same rate as the rich planter; but the answer of the Natal Government would be that it is desired as a matter of policy to impose increased taxation on the native, and that the native will even so be more lightly taxed than in any other part of South Africa. Wishing to impose increased taxation upon the natives, they looked out for a method. The increase of the hut-tax as an alternative was greatly to be deprecated. It would mean over-crowding of huts, with serious consequences affecting at once morality and health. Wishing therefore to adopt the poll-tax, Natal has deprived it of racial significance by making it applicable to all classes and races within the Colony. I cannot believe that the opposition to the poll-tax is more than a symptom of discontent far more general in its character and far more remote in its original cause. I submit to the House that native feeling has been profoundly disturbed by the progress of the war. During a war extending over three years they have witnessed scenes of bloodshed. They have seen the dead Boer farmer amongst the rocks and the wounded British soldier creeping for succour to the kraal, and have heard the distant firing of artillery. They have seen the spectacle prolonged month after month of two white races, whose authority they have always recognised, engaged in fratricidal strife. Such spectacles have produced impressions upon the native mind and aroused excitements in the native breast which it will take many years of calm, prudent, and tactful administration to allay. Upon this, or perhaps beneath it, at any rate simultaneously with it, comes the strange and rather sinister Ethiopian movement, partly religious and wholly and specifically a coloured movement. It is stimulated by coloured missionaries belonging to the African Methodist Episcopalian Church, a branch of the Methodist Episcopalian Church in the United States, one of the oldest, certainly the most powerful and the most remarkable organisation to which negroid civilisation has yet given rise. Missionaries of this Church wander to and fro among the native tribes and villages of South Africa. They repeat the story of Esau and Jacob, of Esau the stronger and the elder who was robbed of his birthright by the craft and fortune of a favoured younger brother. They represent the white men as intruders and robbers who have deprived the native of his inheritance, and they say "Africa for the Africans" and other disconcerting propositions of that character. If to all this be added the indecisive warfare in German East Africa, the prolonged and not altogether unsuccessful resistance which has been maintained season after season by a few poor tribes against German regular troops; if there be added the perceptible hardening against the native which was characteristic of the Milner *regime*, while I say there is no reason for immediate apprehension, I am bound to add that this aspect of South African affairs contains elements which require stern and patient attention. In the presence of such an issue all the harsh discordances which divide the European population in South Africa vanish. Farmer and capitalist, Randlord and miner, and Boer, Briton, and Africander forget their bitter feuds and are all united in the presence of what they regard as the greatest peril which they will ever have to face. Even during the worst stresses of the war it was regarded as a nameless crime on either side to set the black man on his fellow foe. I would ask the House to remember for one moment the figures of the South African census. There were 630,000 whites in 1891 to 3,000,000 natives; in fourteen years time in 1904, 1,135,000 whites, to 5,200,000 natives. In the United States the proportion of white men to natives is eight to one, and even there I believe there is sometimes something approaching to racial difficulties, but in South

Africa the proportion is one white man to five natives. I ask the House to remember the gulf which separates the African negro from the immemorial civilisations of India and China. The House must remember these things in order to appreciate how the colonists feel towards that ever-swelling sea of dark humanity upon which they with all they hate and all they love float somewhat uneasily. In this land of bewildering paradox good produces evil and evil produces good. The gold mines, so long needed to repair the annual deficits, have proved to be the greatest of curses, overwhelming the land from end to end with blood and fire, leaving an evil legacy of debt and animosity behind This black peril, as it is called in the current discussions of the day, is surely as grim a problem as any mind could be forced to face. Yet it is the one bond of union between the European races who live in the country, the one possibility of making them forget the bitter and senseless feuds that have so long prevailed; and which may have led the people of South Africa to look with a real feeling of self-interest and comfort to the armed forces of the British Crown. Let us hope that the presence of a common danger will draw together the two Europeans races and make them forget their long enduring feuds; and let us hope too that the new charity which may come from that feeling of union may lead them to unite, not for the purpose of crushing the native by force, but in the nobler and wiser policy of raising the native to his proper position as an inheritor in what is after all a great estate. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the course of the Imperial Government is clear. The Government believe that in those wide lands there is enough for all. As far as we have any right or power to intervene, whenever our intervention will be useful, or will not be positively harmful, we will labour to compose the racial differences and animosities by which South Africa has been distracted. We will endeavour as far as we can to advance the principle of equal rights of civilised men irrespective of colour. We will encourage as far as may be in our power a careful, patient discrimination between different classes of coloured men. We will not—at least I will pledge myself—hesitate to speak out when necessary if any plain case of cruelty or exploitation of the native for the sordid profit of the white man can be proved. Above all, we will labour to secure as far as we can a proper *status* for our Indian fellow-subjects, and to preserve those large reservations of good, well-watered land where the African aboriginal, for whom civilisation has no charms, may dwell secluded and at peace. The Government will not oppose the Motion of the hon. Member. I recognise the friendly terms in which it is couched and welcome the moderate and sympathetic expressions which have been used in this debate; and believing, Mr. Speaker, that Parliamentary attention is rarely directed to any particular object without good results ultimately ensuing, I am very glad that the House of Commons has chosen to-night to survey from another and too often neglected standpoint, the sombre panorama of South African affairs.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover): I have listened to the opening speeches of the debate with an ominous sense that history may repeat itself in South Africa, and repeat itself disastrously. That apprehension is only partially dispelled by the speech of the Under-Secretary. The assertion in the House of Commons of principles without qualification is a method easily misunderstood in South Africa, and it is with a sense of relief that I watched the hon. Gentleman, not for the first time within a week, climb down from those airy regions of philosophy and general admonition of the whole world to walk on the plane of the earth like another man and see the difficulties that confront other men. It appears, then, that this philanthropy, as far as it costs anything, is going to cost something to our fellow-subjects in South Africa and nothing to us here. The Under-Secretary insisted on the danger of a breach of faith—that the Government are bound by the Vereeniging peace. If the Government is going to give liberty to the South African Colonies and at the same time to insist on absolute equality, not only between Boer and Briton, but between white and native, they will make a worse mess of the application of principles to hard facts than the authors of the French Revolution. The Under-Secretary says that there are grave symptoms of native unrest in South Africa. Ought not Members of Parliament, then, to weigh somewhat carefully the words of such a Motion as this and be very cautious in their speeches on such a Motion? The value of all the limitations in one part of the hon. Member's speech—marred only by the unjust and unfounded attack on Lord Milner—is discounted by the other part of the speech. The Under-Secretary accepts this Motion, and yet one of his own supporters finds much to quarrel with in its terms, because it will not be understood either by Boer or by Briton in South Africa. For years there has been a feeling of soreness in the minds not only of the British but still more in the minds of the Boers, because they thought we dealt in these airy generalisations and imputed to them unjustly a lack of humanity which cannot justly be imputed to either Boer or Briton in South Africa. Our fellow subjects cannot be expected to acquiesce in all these moral reservations if with them statements are volunteered which are wholly impracticable, which show an absence of all knowledge of the conditions under which South African colonists live, and which are injurious to them as men and brothers. What will newspaper readers of South Africa think to-morrow when they see that the mother of Parliaments has been gravely discussing the economic theory that gold mines are of no use to civilisation? What will they think when they find that the hon. Member for the Tyneside Division of Northumberland has committed himself to this statement—

> "What these white men's virtues were I never could ascertain"?

In South Africa that will be understood to mean that in the opinion of the hon. Member the boast of the white that he belongs to a higher civilisation is only a boast and not a fact. The hon. Member cannot offer a greater affront to South African sentiment and cherished convictions than to tell the white inhabitants that they have nothing to teach the natives, for whose good and well-being, in my opinion, they have shown very great regard.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: There was no such statement in my speech.

MR. WYNDHAM: I regret that the hon. Member in a speech, the ability of which we all recognise, should have gone on to draw a distinction between the white races in South Africa, and one not in favour of his own countrymen, at a time when all whites ought to be united in face of native unrest. The hon. Member even went so far as to say that our Empire in South Africa would be charged with the degradation of life. Why, our Empire in South Africa has made any life there possible. The present native races now inhabiting South Africa are new races in that country. In the days of our grandfathers over 1,000,000 men were put to death. The present races exist in South Africa because of British rule. It is only thirty years ago that the Fingoes were almost exterminated; now there are 250,000 of them under the British flag. I have but a few more moments of time at my command. As I have said, I welcome the latter part of the Under-Secretary's speech. I trust that that part, with the omission of his injurious attack on Lord Milner, will be cabled to South Africa, and that much else which has been said to-night will not be cabled to South Africa. May I remind the House, and especially right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, that this is not the first time that the question of the relations of white men with the natives in South Africa has been mishandled? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who knows history well, need scarcely be reminded of the experiences of Lord Glenelg. Let him turn to the index of Dr. Teale's "History of South Africa," which gives an epitome of the history of Lord Glenelg's connection with South Africa. I will read it—

> "Lord Glenelg becomes Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1835—is in full sympathy with the Party represented in South Africa by the Rev. Dr. Phillip—reverses all that Sir Benjamin D'Urban has done, and finally, after causing unbounded discontent and inflicting severe losses on the Cape Colony, is forced in

1839 by his colleagues to resign his Secretaryship of State."

It was his mischievous interference between the Boer and the native races, his failure to show some intelligent sympathy with the difficulties which the Boers had to meet living there with those races, that caused the first great calamity of South Africa—namely, the Great Trek northwards. From that came all the woes of South Africa. It was precipitated by a lack of sympathy in this House with the great difficulties which faced Boer and Briton at every turn in practical life in South Africa, and I beg the Under-Secretary, when next he attempts to soar over their heads and illuminate them with so many copybook maxims [Cries of "Oh"] to recollect the disaster which dogged the adventure of Lord Glenelg, and to devote an even greater portion of his speech than he has to-night to the grave difficulties which face white men under our flag in South Africa.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in any settlement of South African affairs, this House desires a recognition of Imperial responsibility for the protection of all races excluded from equal political rights, the safeguarding of all immigrants against servile conditions of labour, and the guarantee to the native populations of at least their existing status, with the unbroken possession of their liberties in Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and other tribal countries and reservations.—(*Mr. Byles.*)

WINES IMPORTED.

Return ordered, "showing the quantity of wines, at the various degrees of strength, which were imported into the United Kingdom in 1905, from Spain, Portugal, Madeira, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, and other countries (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 105, of Session 1905)."—(*Sir Edward Clarke*).

NAVY (OFFICERS.

Return ordered, "of (1) all Engineer Officers (Active List) of the rank of Engineer-Lieutenant and above serving on shore in the United Kingdom on the 1st day of January, 1906, under the following heads:—

Rank.	Name of last sea-going ship served in, exclusive of manœuvres.	Nature of ship's boilers, water tube or cylindrical.	Date of leaving ship for shore service.	Interval since last service afloat.

(2) All Executive Officers (Active List) now serving at the Admiralty, under the following headings:—

Rank.	Name of last sea-going ship served in, exclusive of manœuvres.	Date of leaving ship for shore service.	Interval since last service afloat.

(3) Average intervals since last Service afloat for all Engineer Officers and for all Executive Officers enumerated above."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*)

Adjourned at one minute before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 1st March, 1906.

VISCOUNT FERRARD.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Algernon William John Clotworthy Skeffington Viscount Ferrard to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: West Cumberland Electric Tramways.

And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with: Mid Derbyshire Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Wallis' Divorce Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to dissolve the marriage of Elizabeth Caroline Wallis with Henry Aubrey Beaumont Wallis, commonly called Aubrey Wallis, her present husband and to enable her to marry again, and for other purposes. Presented (on petition). and a copy of the proceedings in and of the decree of divorce of the King's Bench, Matrimonial Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland delivered (on oath). Bill read 1^a; and to be read 2^a on Monday the 12th instant.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.

Financial Statements for 1902–1903, 1903–1904, and 1904–1905, and Estimates for 1903–1904, 1904–1905, and 1905–1906 (in continuation of [Cd. 1682] July 1903).

BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.

Report of Sir Alexander R. Binnie.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905.

No. 1089. The Postal Order (Inland) Regulations, 1905, dated 12th October, 1905.

No. 1191. The Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment No. 6) Regulations, 1905, dated 29th (September, 1905.

NATIONAL DEBT (SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES).

Account of the gross amount of all sums received and paid by the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt on account of banks for savings and friendly societies in Great Britain and Ireland, from their commencement at 6th August, 1817, to 20th November, 1905, inclusive.

Account of the several transactions which have taken place, during the year ended 20th November, 1905, in the investment of all moneys which came into the hands of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt for savings banks and friendly societies.

Account showing the aggregate amount of the liabilities of the Government to the trustees of savings banks and friendly societies respectively on 20th November 1905, etc.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Public Health Acts was presented by the Lord Hylton; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 18.)

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to establish limited partnerships was presented by the Lord Avebury; r ad 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday the 15th instant. (No. 19.)

PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill for amending the law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in prize courts; (No. 20) and

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to consolidate, with Amendments, the enactments relating to naval prize of war. (No. 21.)

Were presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I am afraid the reading of this Bill a second time to-day, which I have the honour to move, is calculated to make some of your Lordships smile. This is, in more senses than one, the second time on which it has been read. The Bill is one of extreme importance, very seriously affecting an enormous business in this country; and certainly I may say, for my colleagues and myself, that it was considered with the greatest possible care. I had myself, section by section, interviews with persons interested in marine insurance, and if ever there was a Bill which was thoroughly considered by lawyers and by mercantile men interested in its subject matter, I think I may say this Bill was so considered.

It is not for me to say what happened to the Bill last year. I have some doubt whether it was ever mentioned at all in the other House; but, if it was, it certainly never received the consideration it deserves; and I am afraid the dropping of it, or the non-mentioning of it, is not calculated to induce people who have something else to do to go through ninety-six sections of an Act of Parliament of this sort for the express purpose of codifying the law and rendering it intelligible and easily accessible to merchants who are every hour of their lives considering this question. It is one of those Bills which I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, has no Party character whatever. It is simply a matter of business; and I think I may also say that no Party can have attributed to it responsibility for the negligence—I use no harsher word—which permitted this Bill, which is earnestly and anxiously looked for by the whole Mercantile Marine of this country, never to be considered at all in the other House.

I should have been content to leave it to the Lord Chancellor, but he was kind enough to point out to me that if I moved the Second Reading of the Bill he would give it every assistance in his power, reserving to himself, of course, the right of moving Amendments. Acting on that hint I am now moving the Second Reading of the measure. I am conscious that, without the assistance of His Majesty's Government, a Bill of ninety-six sections cannot possibly become law, for there are in the other House persons prepared, not only to move Amendments, of which no one could complain, but to prevent the measure being dealt with. That assistance the Lord Chancellor has intimated that he will, as far as possible, give, and I have much confidence in moving the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, there is a very small point in this Bill to which I drew the attention of the noble and learned Earl on the last occasion when he moved its Second Reading, namely, the definition of insurable value. In Clause 16 it is provided that the insurable value, in the case of a steamship, includes also the machinery, boilers, coals, and engine stores, and so on. I pointed out to the noble and learned Lord that since the Bill had been drafted there had arisen a class of vessel driven by an internal combustion engine, which was in no way provided for in this section, and which, so far as I understand, would not be insurable. I would ask the noble and learned Lord whether he could see his way to insert an Amendment to meet this case. I should be prepared to put one down myself on Committee stage, although I would much prefer that it should appear in the name of the noble and learned Lord, in whose hands, I am sure, the drafting would be much more perfect. The point is an actual one which is not covered by this section, and I hope it will be considered later in the Committee stage.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, this Bill is undoubtedly a very important one to the mercantile community, and it has been considered with great care. Some twelve years ago, when I was Attorney-General, I prepared many of the clauses in concert with a number of shipowners, principally from Liverpool, who were deeply interested. His Majesty's Government will most heartily do their best to further the Bill, and I certainly do not anticipate that there will be any objection to reading it a second time.

On question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I might repeat almost the same observations with regard to this Bill, the only difference being that this is a very much shorter measure and one which your Lordships have been repeatedly engaged in discussing, and that it does not require any legal training to understand and fully comprehend the effect and meaning of every part of it. I will only say this, that we have received the same assurance from the Lord Chancellor with reference to it. At the same time, the noble and learned Lord intimated to me that he intended to move certain Amendments. I have not seen them, but I need not say that I shall be very glad indeed to accept any assistance the noble and learned Lord will give me. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, on behalf of the bankers of England and the Chambers of Commerce I beg to express our thanks to the noble and learned Lord for having introduced this Bill and also the one which preceded it. I sincerely trust, not only that this Bill may pass your Lordships' House, but that His Majesty's Government will give it their support and enable it to be carried through the other House and become law. There is just one point in the Bill which I would earnestly press on the consideration of my noble and learned friend. I refer to the clause which makes all prosecutions under it depend on the consent of the Attorney-General. I should be very glad, and I believe the commercial community generally would be very glad, if the noble and learned Lord could see his way to reconsider that provision of the Bill, at any rate in cases of small amounts, say, under £100. Subject to that, I thank the noble and learned Lord very much for introducing the Bill at this early period of the session, and I earnestly trust that it will become law this year.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I wish to say a single word on behalf of those who are connected neither with the legal nor with the mercantile professions, as to the interest with which this Bill, for the renewal of which we owe our thanks to the noble and learned Lord opposite, is regarded in the country. I have had many communications on the subject, showing how strong is the feeling on the part of those who are interested, not in any technical part of it, but in those large questions of principle and morality which underlie the proposals of the measure. I earnestly hope, not only that your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading, but that it will make progress elsewhere, and that we may see it placed on the Statute Book this session.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the measure of importance which His Majesty's Government attaches to this Bill will be best gauged when I remind the House that a Bill of this character was promised in His Majesty's gracious Speech from the Throne. It was a matter on which the late Lord Russell of Killowen spent a good deal of praiseworthy energy, as did also Sir Edward Fry and others. I have always been most strongly in favour of a Bill of this kind. No one, however, has been more energetic in the matter than my noble and learned friend who preceded me on the Woolsack, and that was one good reason why I thought it appropriate that he should introduce this Bill, and I am heartily glad that he has done so.

The Government do not want to filch any credit that is due elsewhere. But there is another reason. I hope it may be possible that Bills of legal reforms which are wholly divested of any Party complexion may by the mutual co-operation of both sides in both Houses of Parliament be accelerated. I have myself during the last ten years supported not a few Bills introduced by my noble and learned friend, which unfortunately have not been placed on the Statute Book. If this Bill reaches the House of Commons we shall not only give it every assistance, but I am authorised to say that His Majesty's Government will do their best for it, as if it were their own Bill, and they will star it on the Order Paper in the House of Commons, so that it may have a chance of passing into law.

It is, of course impossible to undertake that any Bill should be passed, but I am authorised by the Prime Minister to say that we mean to do our best, in the case of this admirable Bill, to attain that end. There will be some Amendments proposed by the Government. I do not intend to refer to any particular Amendment now, for I think it best to reserve any reference to the matter till the Committee stage. But this I can say, that the Amendments proposed will not be in the slightest degree antagonistic to the Bill, but, on the contrary, are intended for no other purpose than to contribute to the usefulness of this essentially useful measure.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

FOREIGN SEAMEN IN BRITISH SHIPS.

EARL DE LA WARR: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether it is their intention to introduce into the proposed Bill for amending the Merchant Shipping Act a clause relating to the employment of foreign seamen on British ships; and if so, what the nature of that clause is to be, and whether such clause will make it obligatory on shipowners and masters to employ none other than British seamen on their ships.

I venture to submit that the time has arrived when the earnest attention of His Majesty's Government should be given to this important question, with a view to dealing with it as speedily and as effectively as possible. The subject has been mentioned in Parliament on more than one occasion, but no Government has hitherto attempted to find any remedy for a condition of things which should never have been tolerated by a nation which has always claimed to be the first maritime power in the world. We have to face the fact that over 40,000 foreigners are employed in our mercantile marine and in our fishing fleets, and I think it will be generally admitted that in the event of our being involved in a war at sea this foreign element in our merchant service might constitute a very grave danger, and would certainly give rise to serious complications.

But, my Lords, I think there are other evils in the present system which are, perhaps, of a still more pressing nature. One, I think, lies in the fact that over 40,000 British subjects are being kept out of employment on our ships; another is that the safety of our ships, their passengers and cargo, are being endangered constantly under the present system. I remember a few years ago being told by the captain of a British ship that, besides himself there were only two

Englishmen on board, one being the first mate and the other the chief engineer. The rest of the crew was composed of men of all countries, and he added that if an accident should occur he feared the very worst results from his inability to make his crew understand his orders.

I think it will be within the recollection of the House that quite recently, at an inquiry held by the Board of Trade, the Court drew attention to the fact that within one month there had been three inquiries during which it had transpired that certain wrecks had occurred and that the deck hands on those ships were chiefly foreigners who did not even know the English language. I think this is a state of things which should be remedied at the earliest possible opportunity, and I sincerely hope that we shall hear this evening from the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to deal with this matter at an early date.

*The EARL of GRANARD: My Lords, I have had an opportunity of consulting the President of the Board of Trade upon the noble Earl's Question, and I find that the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act which was referred to in His Majesty's gracious Speech has not as yet been finally settled. I gather that it is likely to come before the other House in the course of a very few days. It is not in my power at present to give the noble Earl the information he has asked for, but I am in a position to inform him that the opinions which he represents are fully appreciated by the President of the Board of Trade and by His Majesty's Government as a whole.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, may I just add a word to what has fallen from my noble friend who has just replied on behalf of the Board of Trade? I do so with no discourtesy to the noble Earl who asked the Question, nor with any desire to check the intelligent interest which he takes in this most important subject—a subject which is receiving the attention of His Majesty's Government; but I do not think that it is quite according to precedent, or, indeed, very convenient, that His Majesty's Government should be questioned as to the exact terms of a clause in a Bill which is going to be introduced within a very few days. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask that noble Lords and Members of the other House who are interested in such a measure should wait till the Bill is produced and see what is proposed. I can assure the noble Earl that Mis Majesty's Government do take the keenest interest in this subject. We think it is most important that we should, as far as possible, have our ships manned by men of our own race. But the exact details of the Bill I think we have a right to keep secret until the measure is brought before the House.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 1*st March*, 1906.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with viz:—London Southern Tramways Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS]. (STANDING ORDERS COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have been complied with viz:—West Cumberland Electric Tramways Bill [Lords].

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz:—Mid-Derbyshire Railway Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report to be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

Petition from Finsbury, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (DOCKYARD EXPENSE ACCOUNTS 1904–5).

Annual Accounts presented, for 1904–5 of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 66]

NAVY (VICTUALLING YARD MANUFACTURING ACCOUNTS 1904–5).

Annual Accounts presented, of the Cost of Manufacturing Provisions, Victualling Stores, etc., at the Home Victualling Yards and Malta Yard for 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 67.]

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES).

Annual Accounts presented, for the year 1904–5, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 68.]

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (MONTHLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 69.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Hammersmith Postal Arrangements.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will consider the desirability of including Margravine Road in the postal district of Fulham, rather than in Hammersmith, in which it is at present.

(*Answered by Mr Sydney Buxton.*) Margravine Road is nearer to the Hammersmith than to the Fulham Office, and it would not be possible to transfer it from the postal delivery of Hammersmith to that of Fulham without transferring a considerable number of other streets also, and thus dislocating the arrangements in both districts. Moreover, the Fulham district is already a very large one, and I do not think it desirable to increase it.

Postage Rate for Periodical Literature.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to the inequalities in the postage rates of periodical literature in the United Kingdom; and whether he proposes to grant the cheaper postal transport of magazines so often requested in the public interest.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). I have carefully considered the matter to which the hon. Member refers. The preferential rate of postage enjoyed by newspapers was specifically granted to them under The Post Office Act, 1870, and is restricted by the Act to publications which, *inter alia*, are issued at intervals of not more than seven days, and consist wholly, or in great part, of current news or of articles relating thereto. In view of the loss of revenue which would be involved, I am sorry that I am not in a position to introduce a reduced rate of postage for periodical publications.

MR. NORMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has yet been able to consider the imperial and commercial advantages that would result from cheaper postage rates for periodicals and magazines to British Colonies; and, if so, what action does he propose to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). The matter is receiving my careful consideration; but I fear that I cannot hold out any hope of a general reduction of the rate of postage applicable to periodicals and magazines sent from this country to British Colonies.

London Suburban Telephone Service.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Postmaster-General upon what principle the official charges for the telephone service in the suburbs of London are based; and why the Department are making a fixed charge of £15 per annum or thereabouts, plus message rate, for the use of a telephone in part of the northern postal district, and within six miles of Charing Cross; and whether there is any prospect of this charge being reduced, with a view to popularise the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). The ordinary message rate subscription for a line to any exchange in the London telephone area outside the county of London is £4 a year, with a fee of 1d. for each call on the same exchange and 2d. for a call to another exchange. The unlimited service subscription covering communication with all exchanges throughout the London area is £17 a year. I am not aware of the circumstances of the particular case referred to by the hon. Member. If he will be good enough to furnish me with particulars of the case I shall be happy to make inquiry.

Central Telephone Exchange.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists among subscribers to the Post Office telephones in connection with the working of the Central Exchange of the Post Office telephone system; and whether he will institute an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining the cause of such complaints, and take steps to remedy any matter appearing to call for alteration or amendment.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The lines of the subscribers to the Central Exchange, some 12,000 in number, were transferred to a new switchboard on Saturday the 17th ultimo, in order to allow of some necessary alterations in the Central Exchange switchboard. The transfer temporarily affected the working of some of the subscribers' lines; but the faults were remedied in the course of last week, and the Exchange is now working under normal conditions. The change was of great magnitude, and, though I regret that any inconvenience should have been caused, I consider that great credit is due to the engineers and to the Exchange staff for carrying out a very difficult operation with so little disturbance to the service. I am unaware of any dissatisfaction among the subscribers of the Exchange, so far as its ordinary working is concerned.

Irish Arterial Drainage.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the arterial drainage of Ireland have held any sittings to take evidence; when may a report be expected from the Commission, and is it the intention of the Government to legislate on the subject-matter of the inquiry at an early date?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) During the past two months the Commissioners have held a number of sittings, but a great many witnesses have yet to be examined. The report of the Commission is expected towards the close of the present year. The question of legislation cannot be considered until the report is received.

Trinity College, Dublin, Estates.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether steps have been taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the means by which the purchase by the occupying tenants of their holdings on the estates of which Trinity College, Dublin, is the head landlord; and, if any such, will he state what they are.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). I beg to refer to the reply which I gave on the 21st February to the similar Question of the hon. Member for Mid-Armagh.†

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 348.

Alleged Outrage at Loughrea.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that since an alleged attack was made on Mr. Harry Persse's house, Millmount, Loughrea, some time last year, a large extra force of police have been quartered in Woodville and Kilchreest, he will say whether any portion of the cost is chargeable to the district; and whether, in view of the peaceful state of the district, he will take steps to have the force lowered to its normal level.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The extra police stationed a Woodville and Kilchreest are considered by the police authorities to be necessary to the peace of the district. No charge in respect of extra police is at present made upon any local authorities in county Galway, seeing that the force employed in that country does not exceed the established strength of the county force.

Athenry Outrage.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenent of Ireland whether it was reported to the police, in December last, that a party of armed men had visited the house of John Madden, of Cawnmore, Athenry, and fired several shots through the doors and windows; whether the reason assigned for the action was that Madden had paid his rent against the wishes of other tenants; and whether any attempt was made to trace these persons, and with what success.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that, on the evening of the 15th November last, several shots, apparently from a revolver, were fired outside the house of John Madden. None of the shots struck or entered the house. The police are unable to say whether more than one person was concerned in the offence, as no one was seen by the inmates. There is no evidence enabling me to assign a motive for the offence. The police have made every effort to trace the offender or offenders, but so far without success.

Public Appointment at Cahirciveen.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Cahirciveen District Council and Board of Guardians on 26th July, 1905, pledging itself in future to give no position within its gift to any but Nationalists who are members of the United Irish League and Gaelic League; whether he has any information as to the number of other Irish bodies who have passed similar resolutions; and whether the Local Government Board will restrain district councils and boards of guardians from taking a course which necessarily imposes disabilities upon a large section of the Irish people for political reasons.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Notice of motion to the effect stated appeared on the minutes of the Cahirciveen District Council of 12th July last, but there is no subsequent entry to show that the matter was further dealt with. Without an exhaustive search through the minutes of all the local authorities in Ireland, the Local Government Board are unable to say what similar resolutions have been passed. A general resolution of this nature would not, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, be binding on any future meeting of the board of guardians or rural district council. The Board have no authority to interfere with the rural district councils in these matters; but if boards of guardians were, in advertising vacant posts, to add restrictive conditions of the kind referred to, the Local Government Board would have power to remonstrate, on the ground that the field of selection ought not to be narrowed by excluding candidates qualified by character and capacity.

Kiltimagh Dispensary Doctor.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that in December last the Swinford Board of Guardians, in choosing a medical officer of Kiltimagh dispensary district, rejected a fully-qualified candidate solely upon the ground that he had been educated in Queen's College, Galway; whether his attention has been called to the pastoral letter issued by the Roman Catholic bishops in 1900, in which they urged boards of guardians and other representative bodies needing medical officers to elect only those who have been educated at the Roman Catholic School of Medicine in Dublin; and whether the Local Government Board will make representations with a view of preventing such preference being given in the selection of medical officers in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). The minutes of the proceedings of the board of guardians on the 28th November last show that the guardians rejected a candidate upon the ground stated in the Question. I have not seen the pastoral letter referred to; but, in any event, the matter is not one in which the Local Government Board can intervene, having regard to the fact that the selection of a medical officer rests with the guardians, and that the functions of the Local Government Board are limited to seeing that the person seleced is duly qualified.

Hunting Difficulties in County Galway.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a meeting of the East Galway executive of the United Irish League, held at Ballinasloe on 10th September last, a resolution was passed declaring that the tenant farmers of Galway would not allow any hunt to pass over their lands which is accompanied by any special juror who assisted the Government in imprisoning their friends; whether he is aware that this is part of an crganised system of intimidation directed against special jurors who are true to their oath to return a true verdict according to the evidence; and what measures he proposes to adopt to secure the efficient and impartial administration of justice.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that the meeting referred to was a private meeting held within doors. The police authorities have no evidence of what took place at it; but a resolution to the effect stated was reported in the Press as having been passed at the meeting, which, as the date indicates, took place long before I came into office. The police have no evidence that the resolution has been acted upon, nor is any evidence before me showing that there is an organised system of intimidation against the special jurors in question, or that the impartial administration of justice is now suffering.

Alleged Outrage at Ardrahan.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that four men who were committed for trial on a charge of being concerned in an outrage near Ardrahan, county Galway, when Mr. and Mrs. F. Shawe-Taylor were fired upon by a gang of men and narrowly escaped with their lives, were loudly cheered by the people when they were taken away by the police; and whether the place in which this occurred is one of the districts where the operation of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, has been recently suspended.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) My attention had not been called to this incident of the cheering, which occurred on December 11th last, before I took office. I am now, however, informed that some people who were at Ardrahan fair cheered on the occasion mentioned. The Answer to the latter inquiry is in the affirmative. The men are awaiting trial.

Irish Land—Future Tenants.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he state approximately the number of future tenants now in Ireland, the aggregate amount of rents paid by them annually, and the amount by which that aggregate would by this time have been reduced according to the average reduction for the whole of Ireland had those tenants been allowed to enter the Land Courts; and, having regard to the purposes of the Land Act of 1881, and to the fact that many of those future tenants have been in continuous occupation for more than a quarter of a century, whether His Majesty's Government will open the Land Courts to the future tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Land Commission inform me that they have no information from which they can state, even approximately, the number of future tenants now in Ireland or the aggregate rents payable by them. The only cases in which they have information are cases in which application is made to them by present tenants to fix fair rents, or in which the parties enter into agreements, fixing such rents, either under Section 8 of the Act of 1881, or under Section 17 of the Act of 1896. Under the latter Act future tenants may have fair rents fixed. I cannot at present make any statement as to possible legislation on the subject.

Horse Disease at Waterford — Claims against the War Office.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will make inquiry as to the claims made by the Waterford County Council and the Waterford Agricultural Society in 1905, to be recouped the expenses and losses incurred by these bodies in consequence of the introduction of the disease called epizootic lymphangitis into the county and city of Waterford, by Army horses brought from South Africa, and sent by the War Office authorities to the Waterford military barracks.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I will make inquiry into this matter, but do not expect to be in a position to make a statement on the subject for some little time.

The O'Hara-Trench Estate, County Galway.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the O'Hara Trench property in county Galway met the landlord and agent in May of last year at the rent office to discuss terms of sale and purchase; that both parties agreed to a sale of tenants' holdings at twenty-three years purchase of second-term rents or their equivalent; that the sale fell through owing to the fact that Mr. Trench insisted on retaining the game rights and refused to negotiate further on the matter of sale, and withdrew his offer; and that Mr. Trench has, since the negotiations were broken off, sold seven of the tenanted and occupied holdings to Lord Ashtown without communicating with these seven tenants or giving them a chance of availing of the Purchase Act, 1903; can he say what price Lord Ashtown paid for these holdings; whether it was above or below the tenants' offer, twenty-three years purchase of second-term rents, plus the bonus; and, if so, how much; whether Lord Ashtown has yet paid the purchase-money; and, in the event of a sale of either the O'Hara-Trench or Ashtown properties in the future, the Estates Commissioners will make full inquiry into all the facts of the case.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received a petition from the tenants on the estate referred to. The petition practically sets out the statements made in the Question, and requests that the Commissioners will intervene on the tenants' behalf. The estate has not come before the Commissioners, but they will consider whether now or hereafter they can usefully take any action in the matter.

Longford Court Houses.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at their last meeting the Longford County Council unanimously adopted a resolution asking the Government to give the county council, who pay for and maintain these buildings, the control and custody of the court-houses of their county; and whether, in view of the fact that these buildings in England and Scotland are the property of and in control of the people who pay for them, the like rule will be extended for Irish court houses.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) It is the fact that such a resolution was passed by the Longford County Council. I am not, however, prepared to make a statement as to the change suggested, as the matter would require to be carefully considered, and the object desired would require legislation.

Longford Evicted Tenant—Case of Mary Moran.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Mary Moran, an evicted tenant on the Jessop (Doory) Estate, whose farm is now in possession of a man named George Burnett, who holds it pending sanction of the purchase to him on the eleven months system; and whether, before this sale to Burnett is sanctioned, an inquiry will be made with a view to the restoration of the evicted tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) In April, 1904, the Estates Commissioners received Mrs. Moran's application for re-instatement, in which she stated that she was evicted in 1868. Her case, therefore, does not come within the provisions of Section 2 of the Act of 1903, and she was so informed. The sale of the Jessop Estate was completed in May, 1905, but the Commissioners have no record that Mrs. Moran's former holding was sold.

Government Grant for Mullingar Lunatic Asylum.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that whilst the capitation cost in Mullingar Asylum has gone up to 11s. per head the Government grant of 4s. remains the same; and whether, having regard to the increase of lunacy in Ireland and the decrease of population, coupled with an increase of taxation, the Government will consider the advisability of increasing the Irish capitation grant per head for asylum patients from 4s. to 7s. 6d. per head.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). The net capitation cost in respect of maintenance in Mullingar Asylum amounts to 9s. 9d. per week; but, inclusive of repayments for loans in respect of buildings it is 12s. 8d. per week. The Government grant of 4s. per week is fixed by statute, and I am unable to hold out any hope of legislation to increase the amount. I am informed that the capitation cost in this asylum has not yet recently increased, as implied in the Question, but is now considerably less than it was a few years ago.

Jessop Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the sale of the Jessop, county Longford, estate has yet been sanctioned; whether he is aware that James Rhatigan, of Clonard, Ballymahon, the son of the evicted tenant, has lodged an application with the Estates Commissioners for the restoration to him of his ancestral holding in the townland of Doory, now held by Ambrose Frayne on the eleven months system; and whether the Commissioners, before sanctioning any advance to Frayne, will consider the right of Rhatigan to be restored to this holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). The sale of this estate was completed in May, 1905. The Estates Commissioners have received an application from James Rhatigan, who states that he was evicted from his holding in 1858. His case, therefore, does not come within the provisions of the Act of 1903. The Commissioners have no knowledge of any letting to Ambrose Frayne on the eleven months system; but Mr. Frayne was the purchaser of a holding on the estate, and the advance to him was sanctioned in 1905.

Mountmellick, Assault Case.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of Edward Carroll, Lacken, Queen's County against Constable Masterson and Cryan, Royal Irish Constabulary, late of Mountmellick, for an assault committed at Somergrove, Mountmellick, on March 17th last, heard in the superior courts, a Dublin jury awarded the plantiff £100 damages have been paid, and whether Constable Cryan is still in the force, and, if so, where stationed, and whether there is any account of the whereabouts of Constable Masterson.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). The facts are as stated. The Inspector General informs me that the damages have not yet been paid. Constable Cryan, who is still in the force, is stationed at Oylgate, county Wexford. This constable wrote to the plaintiff's solicitor offering to pay £50 by instalments, but the offer was refused, and nothing further has been done. No account of the whereabouts of Constable Masterson, who is no longer in the force, has been received.

Armagheur Grazing Farm, County Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the grazing farm of Armagheur, comprising a portion of the Miss Nicholson estate, situate at Castlebawldin, near Rivertown, in the county of Sligo, and at present in the Equity Court, has recently been sold to a man named James Murrin;

and will he say whether the Estates Commissioners will consider the advisability of having this ranch utilized for the enlargement of the small uneconomic holdings surrounding him.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are not aware of the matters referred to in the Question. No application or request in respect of the estate of Miss Nicholson has been made to them, and no proceedings in respect of the sale of this estate are pending before them.

Sir Horace Plunkett and South Dublin Election.

MR. O'DOWD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that Sir Horace Plunkett has joined a movement started with the object of making a presentation to Mr. Percy Bernard, who retired from his candidature in South Dublin in order that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland should be returned for that constituency; and will he say if the action of Sir Horace Plunkett in joining a political movement is consistent with the terms on which he holds his present appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*). Sir Horace Plunkett informs me that his action in the matter referred to in the Question was limited to subscribing to a presentation to Mr. Bernard, who had been a personal friend of his for over thirty years. He did not himself attach any political significance to his action, nor did it occur to him that anyone else would.

Proposed Bureau of Forestry for Ireland.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is intended, in the forthcoming inquiry into the *status* and working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, to include an inquiry with the view of establishing a bureau of forestry for Ireland, or of making other suitable arrangements, so that the subject of national afforestation may be taken up systematically on an adequate scale; and also that immediate steps may be at once taken to acquire suitable waste lands, which may be now available through the operation of the Land (Purchase) Acts, that they may be utilised subsequently for planting.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The inquiries which I am making into the working of the Department of Agriculture will not necessarily include the establishment of a bureau of forestry, but I am keenly alive to the great importance of that question. I am considering the institution forthwith of a separate inquiry into it, so as to see whether afforestation can be undertaken systematically, with a prospect of its being made remunerative.

Agricultural Transport in Ireland.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has under consideration any proposals for the promotion of light railways and motor services for agricultural transport in Ireland; whether he will publish any correspondence which may have taken place on the subject; and whether he has considered the advantages to be derived from the use of anthracite coal, which is available in the South of Ireland for gas engines for motor traction.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) No proposals for the promotion of motor services for agricultural transport have been under the consideration of the present Government. There is, therefore, no official correspondence on the subject, and the question of the fuel to be used for such motors has not yet arisen. The question of improving the light railway services, and rendering these railways more serviceable for agricultural and other transport, is one of great imporance, and has been engaging my attention for some weeks past.

Waterford Evicted Tenants.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many evicted tenants have been reinstated under the provisions of the Land Act of 1903 in the county Waterford; whether inquiries will now be made and steps be taken to expedite the restoration to their holdings of the many evicted tenants still unprovided for in that county; whether the Estates Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of, or have agreed to purchase, untenanted lands consisting of 300 acres in the Parker estate, and 800 acres in the Woodrooffe estate, in the county of Waterford.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that eight evicted tenants have been reinstated in this county, and that, in accordance with the recent regulations, they are about to make inquiries into the cases of all evicted tenants who have applied for reinstatement. The Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of the Parker estate, comprising 221 acres of untenanted land, but they have no knowledge of the Woodrooffe estate.

Steam Trawling in Bantry Bay.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that steam trawling within the limits in the inner harbours of Bantry Bay is destructive of the spawn and causing loss to the line and net fishermen; and whether he will grant a sworn inquiry in connection with this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Department of Agriculture are not aware that steam trawling in the inner waters of Bantry Bay is destructive to the spawn of fish. A bye-law prohibiting trawling in the whole of Bantry Bay by steam vessels of more than 20 tons net register has been in existence since the year 1897, and has been successfully enforced. Another bye law limits all trawling in the bay to the hours between 10 o'clock in the morning and sunset, so that nets and lines set at night shall not be interfered with. In the inner harbours of Bantry and Glengarriff, and in a portion of Berehaven, all trawling is prohibited at all times. Since the year 1897, when the bye-laws affecting trawling in Bantry Bay were last revised, no application for an inquiry regarding this method of fishing in the Bantry district has been received.

Land Purchases by the Congested Districts Board in County Cork.

MR. GILHOOLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Bird, Beamish, Bandon, and O'Donovan estates, Kilcrohan parish, county Cork, recently purchased by the Congested Districts Board, will be resold to the tenants who are poor at a loss of 10 per cent., as is allowed under the Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The provision in the Irish Land Act, 1903, for the re-sale of congested estates at a loss not exceeding 10 per cent., applies to purchases by the Land Commission, and not to purchases by the Congested Districts Board, who have full power to sell at any such prices as they may think fit. The estates referred to in the Question have not yet been legally vested in the Board, and, until that is done, arrangements for re-sale cannot be made.

Building Plans for Irish National Schools.

MR. GILHOOLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government has yet come to a decision on the question of new plans, estimates, etc., for Irish national schools; and whether he is aware that inconvenience has already been caused by the delay in settling this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I can add nothing to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for South Kerry last Tuesday, to which I must refer the hon. Member.†

County Monaghan Agricultural Committee and the Department of Agriculture.

MR. O'HARA (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the passage of a resolution by the County Monaghan Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, calling for the reform of the Department of Agriculture so that it will work intelligently for the needs of and in harmony with the people of Ireland; whether he can state when the proposed inquiry into the work of the Department is to begin, and by whom it is to be conducted; and will any representations be received from county committees or county councils as to the future working of the Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) My attention has been called to the resolution referred to. It is intended that the inquiries which I propose to prosecute shall begin at an early date, and I shall shortly be in a position to state the names of the gentlemen who will hold it. I shall arrange that representations received from the bodies named are duly considered at the inquiry.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 1028.

Afflicted Children Bill—Local Opinions.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is yet in a position to state what has been the result of the circular issued to local authorities by the National Board of Education, with the object of ascertaining their views upon the provisions of the Afflicted Children Bill (deaf, dumb, and blind) introduced in the last Parliament; and whether it is the intention of the Government to reintroduce the Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The circular was sent on the 11th September, 1905, to the councils of the thirty-three administrative counties and the six county boroughs. The following is an abstract of the replies received from twenty of these councils:—Matter still to be considered by council, six; matter to be further considered by council, four; no action taken, two; approve of Bill, four; approve, subject to certain suggested amendments, two; disapprove, one; no action will be taken unless present Government proposes to reintroduce the Bill, one. No reply has been received in the remaining nineteen cases. I have not yet had time to fully consider the question of reintroducing the Bill, but I agree that the question is one of importance.

Evicted Tenants Returns.

MR. WALTER LONG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the Returns prepared by the Estates Commissioners, at the instance of the late Government, setting forth by order of counties the names and various other particulars concerning the persons who claimed to be reinstated as evicted tenants or as the representatives of evicted tenants; and whether he will lay these Returns upon the Table of the House for the information of hon. Members, supplemented by the additional details which were called for from the Inspector-General, Royal Irish Constabulary.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Return in question is merely a nominal list of persons who claim to have been evicted, or to be the representatives of persons evicted, from estates. The additional details supplied by the police are corrections of obvious inaccuracies as to habitation and the like appearing on the face of the list. The lists have not as yet been verified by the Estates Commissioners, and cannot at the present time be regarded as authentic. Until they have been so verified, it would not be desirable to lay the lists upon the Table of the House.

Irish Arterial Drainage Inquiry.

MR. WALTER LONG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what progress has been made by the Commission appointed last autumn to investigate the question of arterial drainage in Ireland; and when it is expected that the Commission will complete its labours and present its Report.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners have held a number of sittings, but a great many witnesses have still to be examined. The Commissioners do not anticipate that they will be in a position to present their Report until late in the present year.

Attack on Orangemen at Donemana.

MR. LIDDELL (Down, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Saturday, 17th February, at Donemana, North Tyrone, two prominent Orangemen, named Robert Forbes and Thomas Spence, were attacked in the street by a band of Nationalists, and so badly beaten that Forbes is still confined to his bed by his injuries, and Spence is suffering from a severe wound in the face; whether the police have made any arrests in connection with this assault, and what steps are being taken to protect the people of this district from such attacks.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that the two men named received injuries in a Party quarrel on the date in question. The injured men have expressed the intention of prosecuting their alleged assailants, whom they know. The police have made no arrests, the necessity for that step not having arisen. Two extra policemen have been sent to this village in consequence of assaults and window-breaking by both parties.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners from evicted tenants in the county of Kerry; in how many of such cases have the Commissioners approached the landlords with the view of securing the reinstatement of such tenants; and what is the number of evicted tenants reinstated or provided with holdings in the county by the Commissioners up to the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Four hundred and fifty-three applications for reinstatement have been received by the Estates Commissioners from the evicted tenants in the county Kerry, but in some of the cases the applicants do not come within the provisions of the Act. The Commissioners, in pursuance of the regulations recently issued, are now about to make inquiries in all cases in which they have received applications, and to approach the landlords in such cases as may be desirable. The Commissioners have not themselves effected any reinstatements, but they are aware that thirty-three evicted tenants have been reinstated in the county by landlords.

Royal Irish Constabulary Recruits.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of recruits for the Royal Irish Constabulary taken into the constabulary depôt, Phœnix Park, during the months of September, October, November, and December, 1905, respectively, also January, and February 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The numbers enlisted were as follows: in September 1905, none; in October, 39; in November, 41; in December, 91; in January, 1906, 42; and in February, 55.

Labourers' Cottages in Ireland.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in pursuance of Section 7 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1891, improvement schemes have been formulated by any sanitary authority for the purpose of providing suitable dwellings for agricultural labourers in villages or towns without garden allotments; and if so, will he state the sanitary authority or authorities which have given effect to this section, and the number of cottages erected in Ireland in accordance with its provisions.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Proposals of the nature indicated are merged in schemes to meet the general needs of the labourers in a rural district, and it would be impossible for the Local Government Board to give definite information as to the particular councils which have availed themselves of the statutory provision referred to, and the extent to which they have done so, without making an elaborate investigation into all the schemes submitted since 1891. The Board, however, are in a position to state generally that the section has not been put into operation to any considerable extent, owing no doubt to the advantages of building the cottages which may be required in the vicinity of the villages or towns rather than actually in them. The tenants can in that event be provided with gardens, and are brought nearer to their probable sphere of employment.

Witwatersrand Deep Mine.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what were the considerations which led the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on receipt of the Earl of Selborne's despatch of the 20th November, 1905, to telegraph, on the 23rd December, 1905, urging the Earl of Selborne to obtain information on which to prosecute some person on the Witwatersrand Deep Mine, though he had received no affidavit in support of the prosecution, but to delay till 15th February, 1906, any recommendation to prosecute Mr. Pless, whose cruelty was sworn to by affidavit contained under cover of the same dispatch from the Earl of Selborne of the 20th November, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The inquiry in the telegram of 23rd December, as to whether there was any information on which to prosecute, did not relate to the Witwatersrand Deep Mine, but generally to the proceedings brought into question by Mr. Boland's allegations. The hon. Member might have perceived this by studying the telegrams of 2nd January and 10th January, printed at page 46 and page 58 of the Blue-book [Cd. 2819].

Demerara Labour Troubles.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the recent troubles in Demerara; whether he will indicate the cause of the alleged riot; whether an armed police force was used and H.M.S. "Diamond" urgently dispatched from Bermuda to quell the alleged riot; whether the action taken by the Governor during the troubles was on his own initiative or from instructions received from the Colonial Office; and whether information will be laid upon the Table of this House dealing with the whole matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). The disturbances arose out of a general strike of casual wharf labourers at Georgetown for higher wages. The strikers were joined by the more turbulent classes of the population, and on 1st December the violence of the mob made it necessary for the police to use their firearms. At the request of the Governor, H.M.S. "Sappho" and H.M.S. "Diamond" arrived at Georgetown from Trinidad and Barbados, and detachments of blue-jackets were landed; but no further serious disturbances occurred after their arrival. The Governor acted on his own initiative in the suppression of the disturbances, but the measures which he took have been approved by the Secretary of State. Correspondence on the subjects will shortly be laid upon the Table of the House.

Punitive Expeditions in Southern Nigeria.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the number of punitive expeditions against the natives of Southern Nigeria during 1904–5; what number of natives have been killed and wounded in these expeditions; what number of villages destroyed; what quantity of cattle and other goods seized and carried away; whether the increase in trade referred to by the Governor is looked upon as a satisfactory outcome of these expeditions; whether nearly all the revenue of Nigeria and Lagos is derived from the alcohol traffic; and whether he will consider the advisability of instituting inquiry into the state of affairs in this territory.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). In 1904–5, under the late Administration, there were eight expeditions in disturbed districts of the Southern Nigeria Protectorate. In explanation of these operations it may be urged that they were undertaken in order to put a stop to the murder and robbery of peaceful traders by less civilised tribes, the harbouring of escaped criminals, and assaults on Government servants, and also to check human sacrifices and cannibalism. It is not possible to give exact information as to the numbers killed or damage done in these operations, but in most cases there was little fighting of a serious character. The High Commissioner states that all unnecessary fighting was avoided, and in every case the operations have been followed by the establishment of civil administration in the districts visited, and the requirements of the Government as to stoppage of intertribal fighting, human sacrifice, and interference with traders, have been fully explained to the natives, though not in all cases with entire success. At Onitsha, however, where an industrial exhibition has been held, which was attended by about 20,000 natives, and passed off without the slightest disturbance, although many of those present came from districts where punitive measures had been found necessary only a year before. The total revenue of Southern Nigeria in 1904 was £550,013, of which £322,116 was derived from duties on spirits. The latest figures for Lagos are for the financial year 1903–4. Total revenue, £334,695. Revenue from spirit duties £160,640. While the Secretary of State does not regard any extra-departmental inquiry as necessary, the whole question of the scope and nature of the activities and responsibilities to which His Majesty's Government find themselves committed in Nigeria will engage his serious attention.

Alleged Atrocities in Transvaal Mines.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if sufficient information has been obtained to justify the Crown prosecution of those who circulated the allegations and atrocities in various Transvaal mines, as refuted in Cd. 2786, Despatch No. 41, in view of the sworn statements of the managers, overseers, and staff, and the publicly expressed wish to take legal proceedings to vindicate their character.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). No further information than that given in the despatch referred to by the hon. Member has been received.

Coolie Labour Regulations.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the new regulations governing the employment of the recently engaged Chinese coolies in South Africa are to be applied to all those now employed in the Transvaal.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). Yes, Sir; any modifications of the Labour Importation Amendment Ordinance will apply to all Chinese coolies.

The Transvaal and Responsible Government.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Papers will be published containing any evidence of a practically unanimous demand in the Transvaal for the grant of responsible as distinguished from representative institutions.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). It is not proposed to publish further Papers at present.

Labour Recruitment in British South Africa.

EARL PERCY: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether further recruitment of labour from British Central Africa for the mines of the Transvaal has been prohibited.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). The present position of the matter is as described at page 44 of Cd. 2819. Recruiting ceased on 31st January, and will not be resumed unless the mortality Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1906, show marked improvement.

Lord Selborne's Salary.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the total salary paid to Lord Selborne, and how much of that salary is paid by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom; and whether any other contributions are made out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom to the civil expenditure of the South African Colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). Lord Selborne's total salary is at the rate of £11,000 per annum, of which £3,000 per annum is paid to him as High Commissioner for South Africa from Imperial funds. Other contributions from Imperial funds to civil expenditure in the South African Colonies are estimated to be as follows in the current financial year:—High Commission expenses, £6,400; Southern Rhodesia Resident Commissioner £2,700; Bechuanaland Protectorate, grant in aid of deficiency of revenue, £36,000.

South African Coal Duties.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether duties have been recently imposed or increased in any of the South African Colonies upon imported British coal; if so, whether he can state the amount of the duties, and when they were imposed or raised; and whether he is prepared to suggest in the proper quarter the propriety of removing the Colonial preference given to the South African product, until such time as the financial burden, resulting from the late war, presses less heavily upon coal producers in this country than is the case at present.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The duty on coal imported into the South African Colonies has not, so far as I am aware, been altered since the Customs Convention of 1903, under which a duty of 3s. per ton of 2,000 lbs. is levied. The Secretary of State is not satisfied that he could usefully make the suggestion desired by the hon. Member.

White Labour in the Transvaal.

MR. FIENNES (Oxfordshire, Banbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state how many skilled British miners who are earning good wages will weekly lose their employment through the imporation of Chinese coolies being stopped, natural shrinkage going on, opportunity having been afforded to coolies to break their contracts, and native labour seriously diminishing.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) No, Sir, I can give the House no such figures; it is impossible at present to phophesy as to either increase or decrease.

Importation of Coolies not to be Stopped.

MR. FULLERTON (Cumberland, Egremont): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will consider the desirability of preventing the importation into South Africa of such of the 16,199 coolies whose licences were signed between the 12th and 18th of November last, but who have not yet arrived in South Africa, and prevent the expenditure of £17 10s. per head, the estimated cost of repatriation.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) His Majesty's Government have been advised that they cannot lawfully prevent the importations in question; and their policy in respect of Chinese indentured labour has received in its integrity the support of the House of Commons. It is not now possible to reconsider it. Any contradiction which may exist between this importation and the new scheme for repatriation must be attributed to the clear differences in view and purpose which distinguish the present administration from the old.

Effects of Chinese Repatriation.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have taken into consideration the possibility of the whole of the Chinese labourers in the Transvaal availing themselves of the opportunity of at once returning home at the expense of the Imperial exchequer; and whether any, and, if, so, what steps are in contemplation to deal with such a contingency.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) From the information at their disposal, His Majesty's Government do not regard such a contingency as at all likely to occur.

White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. EDWARD DUNN (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can inform the House of the number of white persons employed in the Transvaal mines on ordinary mining work (as distinguished from work of construction and repair) in each month for the year ending 31st December, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The statistics published by the Mines Department do not enable me to give this information. I would refer the hon. Member to the statement printed at page 11 of Cd. 2563, which gives certain particulars.

Lord Selborne's Despatch of January 6th.

MR. EDWARD DUNN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any and what answer has been received to the third question in the Secretary of State for the Colonies' letter to the Earl of Selborne, of the 5th January, 1906 (Cd. 2819, page 46), asking for a Report showing whether, in the case of Chinese coolies who have served, say, six months on the mines, more or less supervision by white labourers is required, than in the case of coloured labourers, and which question seems to have been overlooked in the reply received to such letter by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the 27th January, 1906 (Cd. 2819, page 87).

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State is still awaiting the report referred to. His inquiry was by a mailed despatch dated 5th January, and could not, therefore, have been answered by Lord Selborne's despatch of 6th January, which reached the Secretary of State on the 27th of that month.

General Botha's Claim.

MR. MORTON (Sutherlandshire): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the case of General Botha, whose house near the Natal border was burnt, like that of nearly all the generals, and who had large claims, which he assessed at £15,000; whether he is aware that they were reduced on the Government assessment to £7,000, and that when General Botha was offered a cheque for £800, which was endorsed "Receipt in full," he declined to give such a receipt, and has not, therefore, received payment; and will he say whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State has not received information as to the claims of General Botha, but he does not understand that his claim has been treated differently from those of others entitled to share in the £3,000,000 provided for ex-burghers. No action is proposed.

Issue of Coolie Labour Import Licences.

MR. WALSH (Lanarkshire, Ince): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, notwithstanding Mr. Lyttelton's telegram of 27th October, intimating that it would be good policy for the mine-owners voluntarily to stop the importation of coolie labour for six months, a greater number of licences were issued in the ensuing three weeks than had been granted in the previous nine months; and whether he is able to lay before the House any other information respecting this increase of licences.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) If my hon. friend will refer to page 8, of Cd. 2788, he will see that he is mistaken in supposing that the number for which licences were issued in November exceeded that for the previous nine months; but they were certainly in excess of the number issued in the preceding six months. The Secretary of State is not in possession of any further particulars of a material character in addition to what is published. The expression by Mr. Lyttelton of his opinion as to what would be a prudent policy for the mine-owners voluntarily to adopt, was not apparently regarded by the Lieutenant Governor as fo the nature of a definite instruction to cease to act upon his discretion without consulting the Secretary of State.

Discharged Arsenal and Factory Workers.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the Secretary of State for War if it is proposed to re-engage the men recently discharged from the arsenals and factories controlled by his Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Any men discharged from the arsenals and factories controlled by the War Department will have the preference for re-engagement should the orders in the coming financial year warrant increase in the numbers of such men employed.

Gun Firing at Cawsand Bay.

MR. DOBSON (Plymouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that numerous complaints have been made that the firing practice from Bovisand, Picklecombe, and Tregantle forts off Plymouth, and especially from a gunboat stationed at Cawsand, is a constant danger to the fishermen engaged in fishing in the vicinity; whether any arrangement was made by the War Office and Naval authorities about two years ago that such firing should take place on Saturdays and Mondays only; and, if so, why such arrangement has not been adhered to.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) None of the complaints to which my hon. friend referred have reached me. None have reached either the War Office or the General Officer Commanding at Plymouth as regards firing from Bovisand, Picklecombe, or Tregantle Forts. As regards the gunboat at Cawsand I have no knowledge of this, and I must refer him to my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty. The arrangement as regards firing on Saturdays and Mondays refers only to the Whitesand Bay batteries and there is no reason to suppose that the by-laws governing such firing have been infringed.

Army Promotions.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Army officers of the rank of major who are not now seconded when holding staff appointments under the present system of allowing extra captains instead; and, further, if he will consider whether majors who are passed over for the appointment of second in command, by reason of their holding staff appointments, should not at once be placed on the list of officers extra-regimentally employed instead of being retained, as at present, on the lists of regiments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of seconding majors while holding staff appointments has been frequently considered, but the financial expenditure involved is held to be prohibitive. There are similar financial objections to the proposal made in the second part of the Question. If these proposals received effect it is estimated that a new charge of some £30,000 a year would be placed upon the taxes.

Waterford Horse Epidemic.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether in or about January, 1905, three horses, the private property of Army officers stationed at Waterford, were destroyed under suspicion of being affected by the disease called epizootic lymphangitis; whether the owners of these horses got compensation for their losses; and, if so, out of what fund was such compensation paid and by whose directions; and what were the amounts claimed and paid respectively in each of the cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The horses in question were destroyed, as they were in close proximity to other horses, the property of the public. As an act of grace the owners were allowed part compensation from Army funds to the extent of £8 10s., £15, and £37 10s. respectively.

Imperial Troops in Natal.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if Imperial troops are to be employed in the disturbed districts of Natal.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War if Imperial troops are to be employed in the disturbed districts of Natal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I will reply at the same time to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for the Tewkesbury Division of Gloucestershire. The 2nd Battalion Cameron Highlanders has been sent to Natal from Pretoria, and there are about 200 men of the Royal Garrison Regiment at Pietermaritzburg. These troops are available for employment in the disturbed districts if required.

Training of Militia Battalions.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): To ask the Secretary of State for War during which months the winter training of the twenty Militia battalions is to take place.

MR. JAMES MASON (Windsor): To ask the Secretary of State for War if Cavalry and Artillery will be trained during the winter, in order to afford to some or all of the Militia battalions opportunities of exercise and manœuvre in company with a mixed force.

MR. JAMES MASON: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will lay upon the Table the Reports from recruiting officers as to the probable effect of the winter training of Militia battalions upon enlistment for the Infantry of the Line; and if the Army Council is satisfied that the winter training will not seriously affect Line recruiting.

MR. HICKS BEACH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he contemplates that the training of certain battalions of Militia during the winter months will have any injurious effect upon the supply of officers for those battalions.

MR. HICKS BEACH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the proposed scheme to train certain battalions of Militia during the winter months, it is intended to include the usual musketry course; or whether a supplementary training will be held during the summer months, when the conditions of light and weather are most favourable for musketry practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) There appears to be some misapprehension as to our proposals with regard to the Militia, and I will, if the hon. Members will permit me, reply to all the Questions regarding Militia training together. The Army Council are selecting twenty Militia Infantry battalions, with which to try an experimental training of six months for recruits on first enlistment. They are also considering whether the training might not be six weeks for these particular battalions, instead of twenty-seven days. The existing system is sixty-three days for recruits and twenty-seven days for Militiamen.

This increased training is in accordance with the recommendation of the Norfolk Commission, and the Army Council are desirous of ascertaining whether such longer periods will fit in with the civil avocations of the non-commissioned officers and men. Infantry only will be selected for the experiment, and General Officers Commanding have been asked their opinions on the units suggested. The training of the battalions will take place, for the present, in the main during the summer, but on this point we are consulting General Officers Commanding in Chief. It will be optional for recruits to enlist for their six months training at any time convenient to themselves. It is not anticipated that any injurious effect will result as regards the supply of Militia officers, and the experiment will show how far the recruiting for the Line is affected. Militiamen will be required to complete at least one annual training before transfer to the regular Army. Increased attention will be devoted to musketry, and a revised course for both recruits and trained Militiamen is under consideration. There are no figures available to show what proportion of Militiamen are habitually unemployed during the winter, but it is hoped that this system may be the means of reducing that number. The annual cost of a Militia battalion under the new system will necessarily be higher than at present. Barracks will be utilised where possible. In other cases hut accommodation or large buildings will be provided when practicable, and failing these, billeting will be resorted to. Our object is to provide as great elasticity as is possible.

War Office Land Purchase in Essex.

MR. A. L. LEVER (Essex, Harwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the purchase of 300 acres of land in the parish of Fingringhoe, near Colchester, Essex, is intended to be completed on 25th March; whether it is intended to purchase the cropping and use the land at once for military purposes; if so, whether he has taken into consideration the effect on the labourers and farm servants who would be thrown out of work, and at a season when they would experience difficulty in finding fresh permanent employment; and whether he will consider the desirability of deferring the completion of the purchase of this land until Michaelmas.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The purchase of this land will be completed on the 25th March. The purchase includes cropping and use of land for military purposes. The effect of turning labourers and farm servants out of work has been carefully considered, as is usual in such cases; but in view of the urgent military requirements of this case, it has been decided that it is necessary to proceed with the purchase without delay. I am afraid, therefore, that it is not possible to adopt my hon. friend's suggestion of deferring the completion of the purchase.

British Trade in Manchuria.

Mr. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware, or has received any complaints, that the Japanese authorities are preventing foreigners, other then Japanese, from proceeding into or landing at any port in Manchuria or sending any goods into the interior of Manchuria, and thus seriously interfering with British trade; and, if so, whether he will take steps to prevent such interference by the Japanese authorities; whether a date has been fixed for the evacuation by the Japanese troops of Chinese territory which prevents the free exchange of commerce between British traders and Chinese merchants.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) Complaints have been received to the effect stated in the Question and representations were made to the Japanese Government at the time on the subject. They expressed their regret that the prohibition was rendered necessary by the railways being required for the movements of Japanese troops; but it was understood from a Report received from His Majesty's Consul at Newchang that this applied to persons only and not to goods. On the receipt of more recent complaints that the prohibition is being enforced against British merchandise, His Majesty's Minister at Peking has been requested to inquire into the matter, and he has despatched the Commercial Attaché to His Majesty's Legation to make investigations at Newchang and to furnish a Report. The evacuation by the Japanese troops of Chinese territory is fixed to take place eighteen months from the signature of the Treaty of Portsmouth of 23rd August 1905.

Dockyard Discharges.

Mr. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state the approximate numbers of men employed and of discharges in consequence of reductions in the Estimates from the 1st of April, 1905, to the 31st January, 1906, in the Royal Dockyards at Portsmouth, Devonport, Chatham, Pembroke, and Sheerness respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The numbers of workmen employed in the dockyards on the dates named below, and the net reductions during the period covered by those dates, were as follows:—

	1st April, 1905.	31st January, 1906.	Net Reductions.
Portsmouth - - -	10,380	8,674	1,706
Devonport - - -	9,032	7,291	1,741
Chatham - - -	8,884	6,950	1,934
Sheerness - - -	2,634	1,740	894
Pembroke - - -	2,720	2,219	501

Beck Commission Bill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether it is intended to re-introduce the Bill recommended by the Beck Commission, providing machinery to compel a judge at a criminal trial to state a case for the Court for Crown Cases Reserved.

(*Answered by Sir Lawson Walton.*) It is not proposed to reintroduce the Bill recommended by the Beck Commission to which the Question refers, but the introduction of a measure by the Government relating to the review of trials and sentences in criminal cases is now under consideration.

Beet Sugar Prices.

Mr. HICKS BEACH: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he will state the average monthly prices per cwt. of 88 per cent. beet sugar, from September, 1903 to January, 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The following statement gives the prices asked for, for each month of the years 1903, 1904, and 1905, and January and February, 1906:—

Month.	1903.		1904.		1905.		1906.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
January - - - -	8	0	8	0	15	8¼	8	2¾
February - - -	8	0	7	10	15	4¼	8	1
March - - - -	8	4¼	8	3¼	14	8	—	
April - - - -	8	7½	8	6¼	13	6	—	
May - - - -	8	4¼	9	4¼	12	1	—	
June - - - -	8	0	9	3¼	11	9	—	
July - - - -	7	11¼	9	7¾	10	6	—	
August - - -	8	5¼	10	5¼	9	7¾	—	
September - - -	8	6	10	10½	8	8¼	—	
October - - -	8	4¾	11	0	8	6	—	
November - - -	8	2¾	13	5¾	8	2½	—	
December - - -	8	3¾	14	1	8	3¼	—	

Alien Pilots on British Ships.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Bill to be brought in to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts will deal with the employment of alien pilots on British ships.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Alien pilots are not employed on British ships in British waters.

Pending Postal Inquiry.

MR. WILES (Islington, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether representatives of the assistants at the Returned Letter Office will be allowed to give evidence before the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the grievances of postal servants.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Committee will be asked to inquire into the position of the principal classes of Post Office servants. It must be left to their discretion as to whom they will desire to hear as witnesses.

Clonmel and Dungarvan Mail Service.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the question of the substitution of a motor service for conveying the mails between Clonmel and Dungarvan instead of the present slow service.

Dungarvan and Lismore Mail Service.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, as the English mails are not now received and delivered in Dungarvan and Lismore until late in the afternoon and too late to permit of a reply on the same day, he will suggest that a motor train should be provided by the railway company to convey the mails which reach Mallow at 10.30 a.m. and Fermoy at 11.30 a.m. to Lismore, which only requires one-half hour, and

Dungarvan, which only requires one hour and five minutes by ordinary train from Fermoy, so as to provide these towns with similar facilities so far as possible to those now enjoyed by Fermoy.

Mr. O'SHEE: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will cause inquiry to be made with a view to providing improved postal facilities for portions of the districts of Old Parish and Ringville.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for Reports on these subjects, and on their receipt I will consider the suggestions of the hon. Member and will communicate the result to him.

Aliens rejected at British Ports.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many aliens have been refused admission at British ports since 1st January; and for what reasons.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The figures for February are not yet available. During January, leave to land was withheld in the case of 202 alien immigrants. In 172 cases the reason was lack of means; in thirty, medical grounds. Appeals were made to immigration boards as regards 199 immigrants; and in the result eighty-nine immigrants, seventy-six on account of lack of means and thirteen on medical grounds, did not receive leave to land.

Directorship of the National Gallery.

Mr. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that the position of Director of the National Gallery has been vacant for a considerable time; and if he can state when and, if possible, by whom the vacancy will be filled.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) I am aware that this position has been vacant for a considerable time. The matter is engaging my attention, but I cannot yet state when the vacancy will be filled.

Saccharine Smuggling.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that smuggled saccharine, of the value of £700, was seized and thrown into the sea by order of the Customs on Monday last; whether it could not have been saved for purposes connected with any Government departments; and if any settled rule is prescribed for dealing with smuggled articles.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I would refer the hon. Baronet to the reply given yesterday on this subject to the hon. Member for Thanet by the Secretary to the Treasury.

Indian Finance.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: To ask the Secretary of State for India what amount of Council drafts on the Indian Treasuries since 1st April, 1905, have been brought to account in excess of the £19,250,000 sterling as entered in the Indian Government's Budget last March; what are the circumstances to which such excess drawings are attributable, and to what purposes have these funds been applied; what are the present amounts of the Indian Government's cash balances, both silver and gold, in India and at Home; if the latter largely exceed the amounts usual in former years; has due consideration been given to the effects on Indian commerce of such large withdrawal of funds formerly available in the Presidency banks for Indian trade purposes; are the recent accumulations of gold here on Indian account due to the artifically established rate of exchange arranged for in 1900; and what is the amount on balance of enfaced rupee paper remitted from or returned to India during the present financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The amount received by the Secretary of State in Council on account of bills and telegraphic transfers in the period from 1st April 1905, to 26th February 1906, is £27,172,530, being an excess of £9,339,530 over the estimate of £17,833,000 for the period from 1st April 1905 to 31st March 1906 which was included in the Budget of the Government of India in March 1905. The excess is due to the large trade demand which it is the practice of the India Office to meet as fully as possible. Of the excess mentioned above, a portion has been used for the purchase of silver, a portion has been invested on account of the gold reserve fund, and a portion, has been temporarily added to the paper currency reserve in England, against a corresponding withdrawal in India. At the end of January 1906, the Treasury balances of the Government of India amounted to Rs. 14,71,00,000 (£9,810,000) of which £240,000 was in gold. On the 26th February 1906 the balance held by the Secretary of State in Council was £7,850,000; on the corresponding date in the four preceding years the figures were as follows:—26th February 1905 £10,323,000; 26th February 1904, £5,914,000; 26th February 1903, £5,086,000; 26th February 1902, £3,560,000. The effect of large sales of Council bills and transfers (which in the present year have been accompanied by heavy coinage of rupees) is not to diminish, but to increase the funds available in India for trade purposes. The holding of gold by the Secretary of State in Council and by the Government of India, as part of the Paper Currency Reserve, is one of the consequences of the successful establishment of a gold standard in India. The amount of rupee paper standing on the books of the Bank of England was on 31st March, 1905, Rs. 16,67,99,800 (£11,120,000), and on 31st January 1906, Rs 16,25,03,400 (£10,834,000), a decrease during the present financial year of Rs. 42,96,400 (£286,000).

Land Grants in South Africa.

SIR CLEMENT HILL (Shrewsbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table Returns of the land grants made in the East Africa Protectorate subsequent to those enumerated in Africa, No. 15, of session 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). A Paper will shortly be laid containing the Returns which have been received up to the present time, and future Returns will be included in the Annual Report on the Protectorate.

African Game Licences.

SIR CLEMENT HILL: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table Returns of the game licences issued, and of the game shot thereunder, in the British Central Africa, East Africa, Uganda, and Somaliland Protectorates, in continuation of the Returns given in Africa, No. 13, of session 1903, and Nos. 2, 5, and 12 of session 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I propose at an early date to lay upon the Table Papers relating to the general question of the preservation of game in the British Possessions in Tropical Africa, and these Papers will include the Returns asked for by the hon. Member.

Regimental Marches through Agricultural Districts.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether route marches through agricultural districts have almost invariably resulted in a number of recruits being obtained; and, if so, whether he will see his way to insisting upon such marches taking place more frequently in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The recruiting marches that have taken place in the last few years have varied considerably in respect of the results attained, and in some cases the numbers of recruits raised do not appear to justify the expenditure involved. The matter rests to a certain extent with the General Officer Commanding in Chief in each command to arrange from the funds at his disposal, but it is not proposed to interfere with his discretion. Any proposals for such marches that may be forwarded to the War Office receive favourable consideration should the state of finances admit of the expenditure involved.

Financial Control of the House of Commons.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will be prepared to give effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee on National Expenditure, and especially that a new rule of Supply should ensure that at least one day should be provided for the consideration by the House of the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee; and that an Estimates Committee should be appointed at the beginning of each session to examine and report into one Class of the Estimates.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) I think a reasonable opportunity should be given for the Report of the Public Accounts Committee being discussed by the House of Commons. The whole question of the manner in which the financial control of the House of Commons should be exercised seems eminently a matter for the Committee on Procedure to consider.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Policy and the Engineers and Artificers.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the Report of the Committee quoted in the statement of Admiralty policy, 30th November, 1905, whether there was a minority Report; whether any artificer engineers or artificers were examined by the Committee; and whether he will lay upon the Table the complete terms of reference, evidence, and the Report or Reports of the Committee.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): There was a minority Report dealing with one point of the enquiry, but it had nothing to do with the engine room staff, on which the Committee were unanimous. The answer to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative. The complete terms of reference to the Committee are given in the statement of Admiralty policy. The Report is a departmental document intended solely for the information and use of the Board of the Admiralty, and as such would not be published.

Corporal Punishment in the Navy.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state upon what ground boys in the Royal Navy who have committed no offence are compelled to witness the infliction of corporal punishment upon their comrades; and whether the Board of Admiralty is prepared to order the abolition of this practice.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The presence of boys at canings is not specifically laid down in the Regulations, but it has hitherto been customary in the Service. Instructions will be issued abrogating this practice in future.

Dockyard Discharges.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a further discharge of workmen from His Majesty's dockyards is contemplated in March next.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No discharges will take place during March. Certain adjustments of the numbers will be necessary in the ensuing financial year, but the details are still under consideration.

Keyham Harbour Works.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the Government contractor for the Keyham Harbour works is purchasing the granite required from Norway, instead of in this country, because the Norwegian workmen will work for about half the wages required by British men, he proposes to take any steps to compel the Norwegian employers who are providing this granite to give the recognised trades union rates of wages, according to the resolution passed some time ago in the House.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): No, Sir.

MR. HUNT: May I ask how men who lose their employment through this unfair foreign competition are going to have work found for them?

*MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Is it not a fact that the granite in Norway cannot be produced, so far as the cost of labour is concerned, any cheaper than in Cornwall, and that the whole difference in cost is the freightage over our privately-owned railways?

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Is it not the case that two-thirds of the granite used at Keyham harbour works is British, and only one-third foreign?

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): Galway granite is the best.

*MR. LAMBERT: I would ask for notice of the Questions put by the hon. Members for Westmoreland and Stoke-on-Trent. As regards the supplementary inquiry put by the hon. Member for Ludlow, the question itself shows that British workmen are taking care of themselves, considering that their wages are double those paid in Norway.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I cannot allow an advertisement of Galway granite to pass without mentioning Aberdeen granite.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member knows perfectly well that no statements are allowed at Question time.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask Mr. Lambert whether, when he is in considering the material for this work, he will bear in mind the fact that the best and cheapest stone in the world is in my constituency?

Directorship of Public Instruction in Bengal.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottinghamshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the feeling which is being felt, and has been expressed in India, regarding the appointment to the office of Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, which will shortly be vacant; and whether he will take steps to provide that the appointment is conferred, in accordance with the practice of the past forty years, on an officer of the India Education Department.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. JOHN MORLEY, Montrose Burgh): I am aware of the matter to which the Question refers. It has already been before the House on more than one occasion last session, when my predecessor explained the reasons which had actuated the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal in appointing a member of the Indian Civil service to succeed Sir A. Pedler as Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, and also that the appointment was purely temporary, and it was intended in two or three years time to revert to the practice of selecting a Director from the Indian Educational Service. I do not propose to interfere with the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the matter.

SIR H. COTTON: For how long a period is the appointment?

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Two or three years, I think.

SIR H. COTTON: That is very vague.

The Partition of Bengal.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any official information showing that there is a subsidence of the feeling against redistribution of Bengal; if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table; and whether he can explain how a partition based on the formation of a new Western Province, consisting of Behar and Chota Nagpur, a redistribution strongly favoured by the inhabitants of these areas and acceptable to the people of Bengal, would involve more taxation than the partition recently sanctioned.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I have no information at present as to the subsidence of local feeling against the partition of Bengal which I can lay on the Table of the House. As regards the latter part of the Question, I understand that, since the matter was decided last June, considerable expenditure has already been incurred in establishing the new head quarters at Dacca, which would be thrown away if the matter were re-opened, and a capital established elsewhere, involving a further expenditure. As regards the opinion of the inhabitants of the areas mentioned in the Question, I must not be understood as making any admission.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: With regard to the first part of my Question, is it not stated in this morning's paper that at a public meeting at Calcutta a bonfire was made of British goods, thus showing the strong feeling that exists?

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I have not had time yet to read this morning's papers.

Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman going to wait until a prison is blown up?

International Sugar Convention.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the present policy of His Majesty's Government to prepare for the eventual termination of British participation in the International Sugar Convention; and, if so, whether it is intended to address any preliminary communication to the Powers interested in order to allow full time for their arrangements to be made.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): We cannot withdraw before September 1908; to do this notice must be given in September 1907. As a large question of policy is involved on which several departments must be consulted and as no decision taken before September 1907 can be effective, the matter has not yet been considered owing to other questions, which are more pressing.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I gather from the terms of the reply that the principle is accepted. If there should be that intention in the minds of the Government, it would be wise to make a preliminary announcement without waiting for the actual date.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Of course, I can say nothing about the intention of the Government until I have consulted the other departments; but if the decision is come to to withdraw, it will be made known as soon as possible in the interests of the trade.

Macedonian Reform.

Mr. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople had the approval of His Majesty's present advisers in consenting that the Commission for controlling the finances of Macedonia should include a member appointed by the Ottoman Government, and that the inspectors should be Ottoman subjects, these concessions having been made after the resignation of the late Government.

Sir EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople was authorised by Lord Lansdowne to sign the note which contained these concessions. It was necessary to make them in order to maintain the concerted action of the Powers without which no result would have been obtained, and it was considered that they did not materially weaken the Commission. I do not think any other course could have been adopted.

China and the Tibetan Convention.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how long negotiations have been proceeding between His Majesty's Government and the Chinese Government in regard to the Tibet Convention of 1904; where these negotiations are now being carried on; whether special officers or plenipotentiaries have been appointed by the respective Governments concerned to conduct the negotiations, and, if so, what are the names and official designations of these officers; and whether it is possible to inform the House when these negotiations are likely to be concluded.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Negotiations for the adhesion of China to the Tibet Convention began before the Convention was signed on 7th September, 1904. They are now proceeding at Peking between His Majesty's Minister and the Foreign Board, but it is not possible to say when they are likely to be concluded.

Consular Commercial Reports.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, in giving the new instructions to His Majesty's Foreign Consuls, he will impress upon them the necessity for rendering in their Reports all returns of weights and values in their English equivalents.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Yes, Sir. This will be done in the next issue of Consular Instructions.

Metropolitan Police and Foreign Languages.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether members of the Metropolitan Police Force learn foreign languages at their own expense, or whether they receive any allowance in money, time, or advantages in the matter of promotion for so doing.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The Home Office has granted a small sum to be given in prizes to men who have made themselves proficient in Yiddish; and it is hardly necessary to say that where an officer's usefulness is increased by his proficiency in a foreign language, this qualification is taken into account along with other considerations when the question arises of his selection for promotion.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of the members of the Metropolitan Police Force who are now learning or have learnt Jüdish-Deutsch or other foreign tongues in order to qualify them for the effective discharge of their duties among the alien population in this Kingdom.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Eighty-one police officers have acquired some knowledge of Yiddish and other foreign languages, and about 130 officers are engaged in learning them.

Trades Disputes Bill.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state when he proposes to introduce his Bill dealing with Trades Disputes.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am not able at present to make any announcement on the subject.

Examinations for Factory Inspectors.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, under the newly proposed scheme of admission to the factory department, candidates will be permitted to administer the Factory Acts for two years before their knowledge of factory law and sanitary science has been tested; and whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that a knowledge of mathematics, economics, chemistry, physics, or practical mechanism need never be acquired by candidates for the inspectorship of factories.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, but I may point out that under the old scheme now superseded the test of a candidate's knowledge of factory law and sanitary science was a mere test of book-knowledge; and the new inspector was obliged, then as now, to gain his much more important practical knowledge of these subjects in the actual work of inspection under the guidance of experienced inspectors. By deferring the examination in factory law and sanitary science until an inspector has done two years actual work, it will be possible to test his practical as well as his theoretical attainments. As regards the second part of my hon. friend's question I may point out that the selection of inspectors is not done merely, or even mainly, by the competitive examination. It is done chiefly by the Secretary of State, who scrutinises closely the qualifications of the candidates on his list, and satisfies himself that every one whom he nominates to take part in an examination possesses such attainments as are likely to fit him for the inspectorate.

In answer to a further Question,

*MR. GLADSTONE said that some time must elapse before he could come to a final decision.

Foreign Pilots on British Ships.

MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R. Whitby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts will deal with the question of foreign pilots and seamen employed on British ships.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): In reply to the hon. Member, I would point out that foreign pilots are not employed on British ships in British waters; but I propose to deal with the question of foreign seamen on such ships.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): May I ask if the Government are going to give any protection to British pilots? Are they going to allow all their rights to be filched away from them by foreigners?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is not the Question put to me by the hon. Member opposite. The question of the employment of masters of foreign ships as pilots is a totally different question, and we may deal with that in the Bill.

MR. JOYCE: I hope you will deal with it in the right way.

British Factories Abroad.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of Board of Trade if he can enumerate the British firms who have been compelled by foreign import duties to open works in foreign countries so as to obtain continued access to the foreign market; and if the goods they there manufacture have access to the British market without payment of a toll to the labour displaced by their migration over the sea.

MR. LLOYD-GEORE: I am not in a position to give the reasons which have actuated firms, whether British, American or German, in opening works in foreign countries. The goods manufactured in such works are admitted to the United Kingdom on the same terms as any similar articles imported from abroad.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can the number of foreign firms established in this country also be enumerated?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Amerian and German firms establish their business abroad exactly as our firms do.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: The right hon. Gentleman is not President of the Board of Trade for America or Germany but for this country. Has the right hon. Gentlemen no list at the Board of Trade of the firms in this country who have established their works in Germany, France, Russia, and other foreign countries in consequence of protective tariffs?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, I have one in my pocket now, and I will show it behind the Speaker's chair to the hon. Member after Questions.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: But why not give it to the House now? Why should I be preferentially treated or have preferential right of access?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I thought that my hon. friend was a believer in preference.

Foreign Tariffs.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the rates of import duties levied in European countries, in the United States, and in Japan upon the produce and manufacture of the United Kingdom still remain at the average rate detailed in the last official return, namely, Russia, 131 per cent.; Spain, 76 per cent.; United States, 73 per cent.; Portugal, 71 per cent.; Austria-Hungary, 35 per cent.; France, 34 per cent.; Argentina, 28 per cent.; Italy, 27 per cent.; Germany, 25 per cent.; Sweden, 23 per cent.; Greece, 19 per cent.; Denmark 18 per cent.; Roumania, 14 per cent.; Belgium, 13 per cent.; Norway, 12 per cent.; Japan, 9 per cent.; and what steps it is proposed to take to secure for British goods in those countries the free market given to foreign goods in the United Kingdom.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Since the publication of the return referred to a new tariff has come into force in Norway, and now tariffs come into force to-day in Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary and Roumania. There have also been some modifications of the Belgium, Italian and Argentina tariffs. In the other countries named the tariffs remain unchanged. The last part of the Question cannot be dealt with within the limits of an Answer, but His Majesty's Government are fully alive to the importance of securing all the advantages possible for British trade in foreign markets.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Are the figures given in the Question generally correct?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: They are not correct.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Are the duties higher now than they were? This is a very important question.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In some respects they are higher, and in other respects lower.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: In what respects?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The hon. Member must know, with all respect to him, that this is a very absurd question. There are about 900 classses of German goods in the tariff, and I cannot go through them in the course of an Answer.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Is it not the case that the prosperity of the countries mentioned in the Question is in inverse ratio to the high tariffs?

[No Answer was returned.]

Steerage Accommodation on Foreign Steamers.

SIR WILLIAM EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether his attention has been called to the report of the medical officer of health to the Corporation of London regarding the insanitary conditions under which steerage passengers are brought to this country in foreign vessels; whether similar conditions are tolerated on English ships; if not, whether steps will be taken to oblige foreign owners to conform to the same sanitary regulations by which British owners engaged on the same trade are bound.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, Sir. My attention has been called to the Report to which the hon. Member refers. Similar conditions are not tolerated on British ships which have to conform to the full requirements of our passenger steamer regulations. I propose to include in the Merchant Shipping Bill shortly to be introduced to Parliament provisions extending these regulations to foreign vessels.

Shipping Statistics.

MR. CAIRNS (Newcastle-on-Tyne) I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he will make an investigation to see whether it be possible to compile reliable statistics whereby the Home trade of the country in volume and value can be recorded, as distinguished from exports and imports, with due regard to the privacy of the business of individual firms.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he will make inquiries to ascertain whether a system can be devised whereby the freight earnings of the British mercantile marine engaged in the oversea trade can be recorded, with due regard to the privacy of the business of individual shipowners.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Board of Trade are fully alive to the importance of both the matters referred to in these Questions, and have already had them under consideration. Any attempt, however, to obtain trustworthy statistics of the kind suggested would involve great difficulties, and would, I fear, be useless without legislation conferring compulsory powers to exact the information. I should welcome any expression of views on the part of the commercial and shipping community as to the acceptability of legislation providing for a periodical census of industry and shipping, for which, from a purely statistical point of view, there is no doubt a good deal to be said.

Free Postage for Members of Parliament.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the tax imposed on Members by having to pay postage on the enormous correspondence they are obliged to deal with in the discharge of their public duties; and whether he will consider the desirability of returning to the old system of franking the letters of Members, or in some other way relieve them of this financial burden.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The Act 3 and 4 Vic. c. 96 expressly abolished the privileges of franking which Members of Parliament had previously enjoyed. I hardly think it would be expedient to revive it, even under the circumstances mentioned by the hon. Member.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) asked whether Cabinet Ministers had not a right to frank their letters, and, if so, why private Members should not have the same privilege.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : The privilege is confined to those in office, and to their official correspondence.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) : Is it not also confined to such official correspondence of Ministers as is written from their offices or from this House ?

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, E.) asked whether in 1840, when franking was abolished, the penny postage did not exist and the conditions consequently were wholly different ?

*Mr. BELLOC (Salford, S.) : Is it not the fact that the greater number of Members of Parliament were in those days very wealthy men, as, thank God, at present they are not ?

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : Circumstances have altered very much since 1840. No doubt penny postage has greatly increased the amount of correspondence, while the average wealth of Members is not so great. But the real difficulty in regard to franking is this, that if it is allowed to 670 Members it is almost impossible to prevent abuse and even fraud. Even under the strictest conditions which prevailed before 1840 this was the case. It was largely on this ground—the difficulty of preventing fraud — that the system of franking was brought to an end.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) : Will the right hon. Gentleman agree to the appointment of a small Committee to consider and report on this matter.

Mr. PIRIE and Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) asked why the privilege could not be confined to letters posted in the House of Commons.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : I, for one, have great sympathy with this view, because correspondence is a very heavy burden on hon. Members of this House. If the hon. Member will give me notice of a Question, I will consider the matter.

Postage on Literature for the Blind.

*Lord VALENTIA (Oxford) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, whether, in view of the fact that embossed literature for the blind is, owing to its weight, subject to a heavy postage rate, he can see his way, considering the small amount of such literature and the poverty of many for whose use it is issued, to allow such documents to pass free through the post, as permitted in some foreign countries ; or, if not, to reduce the postage rate now charged on parcels marked for the blind.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : The hon. Member is perhaps aware that letters in embossed type have been placed on the same footing as printed matter, and can be sent under the existing regulations for a postage of a ½d. up to 2 ozs. in weight. I regret that I do not see my way to give a further concession such as that suggested by the hon. Member. To do so would greatly detract from the simplicity and speed of the postal arrangements, which is of the utmost importance for securing prompt delivery.

Members' Post Office.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can make arrangements for the enlargement of the Members' post office in the Lobby, and also make such changes as will obviate the necessity for Members crowding round the window of the post office, and having to wait until their letters are sorted from among others bearing the same initial letter.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : I am making inquiry in this matter.

Western District Office—Adult Messengers' Overtime Pay.

Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, if he is aware that adult messengers employed at the Western District Office on duty after their usual time, during the week ending 19th January, have not yet received payment for the same ; and when they will receive payment.

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON : The claim for the overtime to which the hon. Member refers was one of the many which arose out of the General Election. The large number of claims has caused some unavoidable delay in settlement, but all amounts still due will be paid very shortly.

Manchester Postmen's Pay.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will take into consideration the position, as regards pay, of the postmen employed within the area of the late Withington Urban District Council, recently absorbed by Manchester, and place them on the Manchester scale of wages; whether he is aware that, although the postal facilities within their area have been increased, their maximum rate of wages is 6s. per week lower than the Manchester maximum; and whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that a Question was asked on the 16th February 1905 on this same subject, and the Answer then was that the matter is at present under consideration.

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The Question has been considered but no adequate ground has been found for increasing the present scale of pay at Withington. The whole question of postmen's pay will, however, be reviewed by the Select Committee which will inquire into the wages of postal servants.

Labour Bureaux.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Report of the Inspector (referred to in Circular 1071 of the Local Government Board) appointed to inquire into the working of existing labour bureaux has been received; and, if received, why it has not been published in accordance with the terms of Circular 1071.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The Report referred to has been received. The intimation given in the Circular was to the effect that after the receipt of the Report some further communication would probably be made to the local bodies concerned. This is now under consideration.

Aged Poor.

MR. BARNES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of persons over the age of sixty-five who are in receipt of poor law relief and the annual cost of such relief.

MR. JOHN BURNS: According to the latest return on the subject the number of persons over sixty-five in receipt of relief in England and Wales was, on 1st September, 1903, 284,265 (excluding casual paupers, lunatics in asylums and persons only constructively in receipt on account of relief given to wives or children). As regards the cost of relief to persons above sixty-five, I can only repeat what I stated the day before yesterday, in reply to my hon. friend the Member for the Tottenham Division, that I am not able to give this information, and that I fear it would not be practicable to obtain it.

Importation of Canadian Cattle.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if it is proposed to open British ports to the importation of any colonial or foreign store cattle.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I am not in a position as yet to add anything to the reply which my noble friend gave on this subject to the deputation which he received from the Free Importation of Canadian Cattle Association on the 5th ultimo. I shall be happy to supply the hon. Member with a verbatim Report of the proceedings on that occasion. My noble friend has arranged to receive a further deputation on the 6th inst., at which the views of the Central Chamber of Agriculture and other agricultural bodies are to be submitted to him, and, as the hon. Member is aware, a Bill on the subject has been introduced by my hon. friend the Member for Newcastle, the Second Reading of which is fixed for Friday the 6th April. On both these occasions further statements as to the position of the Government in the matter will be made.

In answer to a further question Sir EDWARD STRACHEY promised to consider if the Report could be laid for the convenience of Members.

Vacant Crown Lands.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the details of the rental for the year 1904–5, amounting to £513,760 9s. 7d., mentioned in page 166 of the eighty-third Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, dated 29th June, 1905, and where any information in connection with the specific rentals, the amount of each rental, the tenure, the character, whether agricultural or otherwise, can be found; whether there are in any, and what, counties agricultural or farming lands vacant and unlet which are available for the purpose of use by the unemployed under the direction of the Distress Committees; and what is the total acreage of agricultural land in each county, or land available for such purpose, under the charge of the Commissioners.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Detailed particulars of leases granted each year are given in the appendices to the Commissioners of Woods Report for that year. A classification of the rents collected by Mr. Stafford Howard is given in the report for 1905, see pp. 3 to 7. A classification of the rental collected by Mr. Horner was given in the Report for 1901, pages 84 to 103, and the variations that have occurred since by purchases, sales, re-lettings, etc., are for the most part shown in the subsequent reports. The Report for 1905, page 74, gives details of the agricultural lands which are temporarily in hand for want of suitable tenants. These lands are all in course of cultivation, the necessary labour being employed by the Commissioners of Woods. The Commissioners have no power to appropriate the land for use by the unemployed under the Distress Committee unless on payment of adequate rents.

Customs Statistical Office

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the overtime work, performed by abstractors in the Customs Statistical Office on the preparation of the monthly and annual statements of trade, is compulsory, and whether, seeing that the rate of pay is less per hour than that earned during the official day in a large number of cases, a higher rate per hour can be introduced.

MR. McKENNA: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The rates of overtime pay for abstractors are fixed on grounds of convenience on a sliding scale, which gives a rate, sometimes above, sometimes below, but fairly represents on the average the actual rate of pay. I see no reason to change the rates of overtime which were improved only last year.

Queen's Colleges in Ireland.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Treasury have signified their concurrence in the proposal made to them by the late Government in favour of an additional endowment for the Queen's Colleges at Belfast and Cork; and, if so, what provision is proposed to be made for the purpose in the Estimates for 1906–7.

MR. McKENNA: A sum of £5,400 is being taken in the Estimates for 1906–7 for buildings at Queen's College, Belfast, conditionally on an equal sum being appropriated to the same purpose from funds raised by public subscription. The case of Queen's College, Cork, will be considered if the same condition is satisfied; but no scheme for new buildings at Cork has yet been matured, and I am not aware that any local contributions have been promised. It is therefore not proposed to make any provision for Cork in the Estimates for 1906–7, except a small sum for minor improvements.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked whether it was not the fact that the late Prime Minister and the right hon. Member for Dover when Chief Secretary stated that they could not approve additional endowments for the

Queen's College in Belfast, except as part of the general settlement of the University question which would provide additional facilities for the University education of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

MR. McKENNA: The hon. Member is correct in what he says, but the change was made by the right hon. Member for South Dublin. I believe that £72,000 was subscribed in Belfast.

County Court Printing and Stationery Contracts.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the dissatisfaction caused by the threatened change in the source of supplies of stationery and printed matter, namely, from local printers to His Majesty's Stationery Office, in use in County Courts; and whether, in view of the inconvenience and delays which will occur in the work of Courts, and the loss entailed on the local printers and the dismissal of some of their employees, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. McKENNA: The supplies of printing for the County Courts will continue to be drawn from the local printers, provided that the Controller of the Stationery Office is satisfied as to the reasonableness of the charges. Stationery, however, as distinguished from printing, will be supplied (saving existing orders) from the Stationery Office, as it appears that a large economy can be effected in this manner.

Training of Teachers.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether he will at once consider the desirability of amending the regulation which comes into force next year, and make it quite clear that the Education Department will encourage university training to be given in the elementary teachers' training colleges, having regard to the fact that most of the students in training are the sons and daughters of those who are unable to give them an opportunity to obtain degrees in either of the universities.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): In replying to the Question I should like to assure the hon. Member that the Board of Education have no desire to discourage the entrance to University courses and the acquisition of University degrees on the part of persons intending to become elementary school teachers, who are qualified to profit by such courses and to obtain the degrees. The intention of the circular to which the hon. Member seems to refer in his Question is not to discourage this movement, but to secure that persons of inadequate attainments should not be diverted from other courses of training more suited to them. I am giving the whole matter my most careful consideration as I recognise the importance of the issues involved, but I must remind the hon. Member that these grants are voted by Parliament to secure the regular supply of competent teachers for our elementary schools, and that the Board are bound to see that other objects, however desirable in themselves, are not allowed to supersede this primary purpose.

MR. CROOKS: Is it not the case that the permanent officials of the Department discourage rather than encourage the movement?

MR. BIRRELL: I hope not. It is not my view that they should.

Examinations in Welsh Subjects.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I began to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether he has received representations from any local education authorities of the Principality in respect to the omission from the regulations and syllabus for the preliminary examination for the certificate, 1907, of Welsh subjects, and respectfully urging him to restore the subject of Welsh to a position of at least equal prominence to that which it enjoyed in the Code for former years; can he say why Welsh has been omitted; and does he propose to respond favourably to the appeals that have been made for its restoration to the Code?

MR. BIRRELL: A revised edition of the regulations referred to will be published, I hope, on Monday next. I think that the hon. Member will find that the various points in regard to Welsh subjects upon which representations have been made, are satisfactorily dealt with.

Kensington Avenue School, East Ham.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether the attention of the Board has been called to the report of the medical officer of health at East Ham on the over-crowded condition of Kensington Avenue school, and on the number of vacant places in the neighbouring school at Monega Road, and whether he has taken or will take any action in the matter, and, if so, what action.

*MR. BIRRELL: A copy of the Report in question has been forwarded to the Board by a correspondent. I understand that the Local Authority has taken prompt measures to meet the complaints of their Medical Officer. No action for the present, at any rate, appears to be needed on the part of the Board.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: Is it not the fact that the local education authority have postponed any action until the end of the educational year.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not aware that that is so. I will look into it.

Commercial Corruption.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General, when the Government propose to introduce the Bill to prevent secret commissions or commercial corruption, referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir LAWSON WALTON, Leeds, S.): I understand that a Bill to prevent secret commissions or commercial corruption will shortly be introduced into the House of Lords by the ex-Lord Chancellor, and will be supported by the present Lord Chancellor.

Church Rates in Scotland.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, whether his attention has been called to the proceedings taking place in the parish of Old Machar, which embraces a large section of the town of Aberdeen, under which owners of land and houses have been assessed for the payment of rates in support of a church and a manse with which a majority of the ratepayers have no acquaintance or concern, and to the fact that these assessments are levied under a threat of seizure and sale of the goods of those who resist the exaction; if he is aware of the dissatisfaction prevailing throughout Scotland in connection with the above and many similar proceedings; and if the Government will be prepared to bring in a Bill for the abolition of church and manse rates in Scotland.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfar): My attention has been called to the proceedings referred to by the hon. Member. The Government is alive to the dissatisfaction with which these proceedings are regarded. They are not prepared to bring in such a Bill.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Church rate has been abolished south of the Tweed and will he take steps to give similar relief in the North?

AN HON. MEMBER: And is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these funds are no longer applied to national purposes? Will he see that that is altered?

MR. SINCLAIR: I can add nothing to my Answer.

MR. PIRIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Lord Advocate has already expressed his opinion that those rates should be entirely abolished?

*MR. SPEAKER ruled the Question out of Order.

Scotland and the Housing of the Working Classes Act.

MR. BARNES: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will take the necessary steps to put Scottish municipal authorities on an equal footing with those of England in regard to the term of repayments under the provisions of the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890.

MR. SINCLAIR: It is not clear that Scottish opinion demands so long a period as the eighty years permissible under the English Act of 1903, but I shall be glad to consider any representations on the subject.

Sligo Conspiracy Trials.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, whether he is aware that at the trial of Messrs. John O'Dowd, M.P., Conor O'Kelly, M.P., and James Mills, J.P., for alleged conspiracy at the recent winter assizes at Sligo, every member of the jury empanelled to try the case was a Unionist in politics and a Protestant in religion; that all Catholic jurors, to the number of eighteen, who were called to the box, were ordered to stand by, and that in the same case nine Protestants were ordered to stand by; is he aware that the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Powell, stated in reply to the judge that the Crown Solicitor was acting on the instructions of the Attorney-General in ordering certain jurors to stand by; and that the Crown Solicitor in the case has since been promoted to the position of Chief Crown Solicitor for Ireland; and what steps does he propose to take to prevent in Ireland the abuse of the practice of the Crown of unlimited challenge without cause assigned.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool Exchange): At the trial referred to, the number of persons called as jurors and ordered by the Crown to stand by was, as stated, twenty-seven. The Crown Solicitor informs me that he did not inquire into the religion or politics of the jurors; and I do not know, and I have no means of ascertaining, what their opinions on political or religious matters were, or now are. The Senior Crown Prosecutor stated at the trial, in reply to the learned judge, that the Crown Solicitor was acting under the authority of the Attorney-General in challenging as he did. As the hon. Member is aware, I was not at the time Attorney-General, and I know nothing of the facts personally. The Gentleman who was at the time Crown Solicitor for Mayo has since been promoted to the position of Chief Crown Solicitor for Ireland. In reply to the last paragraph of the Question, I beg to say that I propose immediately to call the attention of all the Crown Solicitors in Ireland to the Rule, originally issued in 1894, that no person should be directed to stand by on account of his religious or political opinions, and to impress upon them the importance of strict compliance with it. I am also conducting inquiries with a view to ascertaining whether it is possible, with due regard to the interests of justice, to make any change in the rules at present in force upon this subject.

MR. LONSDALE: Is there not an organised system of intimidation of the special jurors in the West of Ireland who have to deal with agrarian offences?

MR. CHERRY: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Private Bags at the Wexford Post Office.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, whether he is aware that the manufacturing firm of Messrs. Pierce and Company, cycle and machine makers, Wexford, have for many years had the right of a private bag for their letters, on a payment of two guineas per year, but that on renewing the fee this year an increased fee of three guineas was demanded; and whether he will direct that the sum formerly charged be still accepted from this firm.

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: It would seem that owing to some misapprehension a fee of one guinea only has hitherto been charged for the rent of a private box at the Wexford Post Office, whereas the fee ought to have been £2 2s., which with the fee of £1 1s. for private bag makes £3 3s. in all. Messrs. Pierce and Company have for many years had the benefit of the service although they have not paid the full fee; but now that the error has been discovered they must of course be charged the proper fee.

Keadue (Roscommon) Telegraph Office.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, whether it is intended to establish a telegraph office at Keadue, county Roscommon, the necessary guarantee having been given by the Boyle No. 1 district council; whether care will be taken that other than licensed premises will be secured for the purpose; and whether any applications have already been received?

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The Boyle No. 1 district council intimated on the 21st ultimo that they are prepared to give the guarantee required in connection with the provision of telegraph facilities at Keadue, and a draft agreement for giving effect to the arrangement was sent to the board on the 27th ultimo. As the sub-postmistress, who has held the office since 1880, is able and willing to undertake the new business, and as it is understood that she is prepared to provide the necessary accommodation, there is not likely to be a vacancy; but one application for appointment has been received.

Unemployed White Labour in the Transvaal.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he will be prepared to offer to English workmen thrown out of work in the Transvaal, owing to the departure of the Chinese, the privilege of returning to England at the expense of the Imperial Exchequer.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.): The contingency has not arisen, and I see no reason for making any provision against it.

Tea Duty and the Budget.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, with a view to preventing disturbance in the tea trade, which has twice been disorganised by alterations of duty during the last two years, he can now say if he proposes to reduce the tea duty this year.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am unable to depart from the established practice of declining to give any information as to the intentions of the Government with reference to duties upon commodities in advance of the Budget Statement.

The Royal Commission on Canals.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the reference to the proposed Royal Commission on Canals, he will include an Instruction to the Commission to inquire into the canal systems of other countries, including India, with the object of ascertaining to what extent navigable canals pay a satisfactory return upon the capital invested in their construction.

Mr. ASQUITH (for Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman): I do not think such an instruction is desirable; the reference, which has been carefully settled, will give the Commission full discretion to take evidence upon the canal systems in other countries.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what business he proposes to take next week?

Mr. ASQUITH: As a result of the dislocation of our arrangements we have had to do the best we can and must ask the indulgence of the House. Next Monday the Government propose to take the Civil Service Vote on account. On Tuesday Naval Supply will be taken, and on Wednesday Naval Supply again, or if it is possible, Report of the Vote on account. I cannot pledge myself absolutely as regards Thursday, but if everybody is then in a normal state of health we may possibly take the free-trade resolution.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

It being now five minutes to three o'clock, thirty-six starred Questions to the Irish Office, seventeen to the Colonial Office, and twelve to the War Office remained unanswered.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention had been called to the fact that to-day in the time allocated to Questions, less than one-half of the Questions on the Paper were asked, and also that all the Irish Questions put down to the Chief Secretary were excluded; and whether the Government would consider this matter when they prepared the scheme which they were about to submit to the Committee on Procedure, with a view to giving more time to all Questions.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have been very much struck almost every day since the House has met by the extreme unfairness of the existing arrangements. The hon. Gentleman and his friends happen to be the victims to-day, but also not a single Question addressed to the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, many of them of the greatest importance, and not a single Question addressed to the Secretary for War, have been reached. That is a very serious and inconvenient state of things and one which will engage the attention, I hope, of the Committee, as it will of the Government.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

James Murray, esquire, for the County of Aberdeen (Eastern Division).

SELECTION (UNOPPOSED BILL COMMITTEES) (PANEL).

Sir Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had selected the following seven Members to be the Panel to serve on Unopposed Bill Committees under Standing Order No. 109: Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Beale, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. J. W. Hills, and Mr. Mooney.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): I am sure the whole House regrets the circumstances which have led to the alteration of our arrangements for to-day, and nobody has more cause to regret them than I have, because at a few hours notice I am called upon to propose the Navy Estimates for the coming year. The whole Board of Admiralty, too, have been put upon short notice. We have only been in office a few weeks. But there are some mitigating circumstances. The Navy Estimates, although they are usually the largest, most complicated, and, I think, the most important of all the Estimates, are usually the most non-contentious. There are special features in the present year's Estimates which the House will allow me to allude to briefly. On coming into office a few weeks ago we found the Estimates for the coming year practically complete, and the result of them had been made public in an Admiralty Memorandum. That is the first fact to which I would call attention. In the second place we found ourselves in the presence of a new policy, also complete, also made public, and already actually in operation or only waiting formal sanction. The third fact upon which I would lay special stress is that we found ourselves allied with four naval colleagues who had been members of the late Board, and, as such, responsible both for the Estimates and for the naval policy which those Estimates expressed. The four Sea Lords were continued in office by my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, according to tradition, which I think ts a good tradition, ensuring thereby hie continuity of naval policy and advice. The Sea Lords form a sort of nucleus crew at the Admiralty. These facts justify, I think, the attitude of the new Board which I am now about to describe both as to the Estimates and the policy. With the exception of a few minor adjustments, we have accepted the Estimates as they came into our hands from our predecessors. There are one or two points of detail in which we made some slight alteration. One of these is Rosyth. The item for Rosyth has been struck out of these Estimates, but I do not want anybody to run away with the idea that the Rosyth scheme has been abandoned. On the contrary, there is no intention of abandoning or of departing from the scheme; but, in view of the requirements of the new type of vessels and possible modifications in designs, it has been decided to give some further consideration to the details of the scheme. For this reason, and for this reason only, no definite sum can yet be set down as the total amount required. The sum still remaining to be spent under the loan is quite sufficient for the preliminary work now going on. There are also certain new proposals with regard to Portsmouth. As to these, I may say on behalf of the Admiralty that we consider it undesirable that the closed repairing basins should have only one entrance. It is most undesirable that any important closed repairing basin should have only one access, and it is equally important that one of these should be in the nature of a lock, so that vessels can enter or leave the basin at all times independently of the state of the tide. The entrances to the basins at Portsmouth at present, with one exception, are not of sufficient width to take vessels like the "Dreadnought," and the locks are not long enough to take several of our armoured cruisers or the "Invincible" class. The alterations therefore, are intended to get over these disadvantages, which are not such as should be allowed to remain in our most important dockyard. The lengthening of the building slip at Portsmouth is also necessary, as longer vessels than the "Dreadnought" are contemplated, and a re-arrangement of the buildings in the vicinity is necessary for more economical production. The only other point that I need dwell upon here is as to the new ship-building programme set out in Vote 8. It is a considerable programme, but it will be observed that only a comparatively small sum of money is to be taken for the new shipbuilding which is to be absolutely begun in this coming financial year. The building of the four large vessels will not commence until quite late in the year, and as to these vessels we do not propose to ask the House to tie its hands at present. It has been the regular practice for many years past to defer the consideration of Vote 8 to a comparatively late period of the session. In respect of that portion of the Estimates, therefore, I claim a certain amount of freedom, and I hope the House will be content on this as on former occasions to leave the consideration of the details of Vote 8 until somewhere about June.

Now I come to our attitude towards the policy which underlies a great portion of these Estimates. I have described it as a new policy. It is a policy which is the result of much patient study, and it is a policy which demands much patient study from us. Want of time alone would prevent us from declaring now that we disagree with any portion of that policy, considering by whom it was originated and considering the responsibility of our own naval colleagues in regard to it. The very limited time we have had at our disposal, while it makes it impossible for us to say that we disagree with any portion of this policy, is also a good reason against our committing ourselves irrevocably to it. As to the various items of policy set forth in the Cawdor Memorandum, I may say that the Government will accept it and act upon it. Where a formal Order in Council is all that is wanted to carry the new policy into effect we shall allow that Order to pass. We shall put the proposals of the Memorandum into execution without prejudice, without any unfavourable suggestion with regard to them, and watch and wait. That is all we can be called upon at the present moment to do. Perhaps there is one point on which I ought to make a reservation. All the items contained in the Cawdor Memorandum are not in operation, and there are some—one I have in my mind—to which my observation would not apply. A new scheme of training is in operation. It is a fact, and we propose that it should go on and be watched carefully. But there is a proposal in the Cawdor Memorandum which is a development of the original scheme, which will not come into operation for three years or more, and to which, therefore, my observations would not apply. I mean the new proposal with reference to the non-specialisation in future of the various ranks of offices. I do not, however, say anything against or in favour of that alteration. The Cawdor Memorandum will no doubt be discussed a great deal in this House. I am sure we regret the absence of the late member for King's Lynn, but his place is taken, I am glad to hear, by several naval experts, and I am sure no one will listen with more interest or with greater desire to learn from their expert knowledge than I shall.

Another matter I want to refer to is the question of the Naval expenditure involved in these Estimates. We ought to take the gross figure, the whole amount called for by the Estimates, including the sum voted for appropriations in aid which the Admiralty is allowed to use on its own responsibility. I intend also to count in some other items. Accordingly this year, instead of the net expenditure of £31,865,000, I ask the House to take the estimated expenditure on the Navy at the sum of £33,573,000. That is the real expenditure. To that I must add the comparatively small sum of £369,000 which is expended on behalf of the Navy by other Departments of the State. Account should also be taken of the sum which is being expended or will be expended under the Naval Works Loan Act. I am informed that the anticipated expenditure out of the loan for the year 1905–6 is somewhere about £3,500,000. The amount which we are likely to expend under the loan in the coming financial year is, I am told £3,200,000. If you add all those items together you have a large and quite misleading figure, because it is necessary you should deduct an amount in connection with annuities. After making the necessary allowance, the entire Naval expenditure for the present year is not less than £36,000,000. That may seem to some new Members, and some Members who have only been in the habit of looking at the net Naval Estimate, a very large sum; but let me remind you that only two years ago the Naval expenditure of this country estimated in the same way would have turned out to be not less than £42,000,000. At one time it seemed likely to be £43,000,000. We have this consoling fact, that, taking the gross expenditure all round, we are spending £6,000,000 less this year than we were spending two years ago. We anticipate an expenditure under loan in the new financial year amounting to £3,200,000. The borrowing power as it stood under the last Act, passed last year, will not be exhausted by the expenditure of next year. There will be a margin of over £1,000,000. That is to say, if our ideas are realised, on March 31st, 1907, there will remain unexpended a borrowing power under the Act amounting to about £1,000,000. Then this has to be considered also—the Acts as they stand do not create borrowing powers to the full extent of the estimated cost of the works authorised by this House. There is a balance unprovided for in connection with the cost of works authorised amounting to about £4,613,000. That is the difference between the estimated cost of works authorised and the amount of borrowing power provided by the Act. It has nothing to do with £1,000,000 which remains over under the existing borrowing powers. I may be asked how it is proposed to provide for the works which are unprovided for. Last year there was a general consensus of opinion on both sides of the House that the *regime* of loan works should, as soon as possible, be brought to an end. What is to be done at the end of the year 1907? The question was not really settled in the House last year, and there has not been time to deal with it yet this year. It is a question which must be left over for consideration. More than a year must elapse before any new policy can come into effect.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): May I take it that the right hon. Gentleman adheres to the policy announced by the late Government that no new works should be introduced into the works loan?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Most assuredly. The only doubt I ventured to insinuate is really only because of my own ignorance. No decision has been come to as to old loan work for which sufficient provision has not been made. I should like to ask the House to listen to a statement of the growth of expenditure dealing with the gross Estimate of the year. Some eleven years ago, at the beginning of the year in which I last had anything to do with the Navy—the year 1895–6—the gross expenditure on the Navy in the Navy Estimates was £20,700,000. It rose the next year to £23,000,000. It stood there for a year, and then bounded up in 1898–1899 to £25,000,000. In the following year, 1899–1900, it rose to £27,000,000, in the following year to £31,000,000, and again in the year after to £32,000,000. It stood there for twelve months, and then bounded up again to £37,000,000. We now come to the great culminating year of expenditure, the year 1904–5, when the gross Naval Estimates rose to no less a sum than £38,327,000. Last year they were reduced to £35,000,000, and this year they are down again to £33,000,000. The Estimates I am now proposing to the House show roughly a reduced expenditure amounting to £1,500,000; but it is not for us to claim the credit for that. This reduction was an essential feature of the Estimates which came from the hands of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I think it is only fair and honest that that should be stated. I think it should also be stated that this reduction may be regarded by some financial experts as perhaps more apparent than real. For instance, some part of it is undoubtedly due to using money belonging to this financial year for the purchase of armour which would otherwise have fallen on the next financial year. In the now expiring financial year, 1905–6, a sum amounting to £289,000 will be taken and applied to the purchase of armour, which purchase would naturally have fallen on the new Estimates, which are correspondingly lower by that amount. This enters into the £1,500,000 reduction which I have stated to the House. There is another item which also affects the diminution. A considerable part — I should think as large a part as I have referred to—of the reduction this year is due to the use of stores without replacing them. I am now speaking financially and not in any way in regard to policy. I do not believe that the efficiency of the Navy or the sufficiency of the stores will be found to have suffered in the least by this operation. The credit of all that, the amount of the saving and the mode by which it has been accomplished, belongs to our predecessors in office, and we take it over from them. The only difference we make is this. According to the practice of the House, I apprehend that we might have applied this money to the purchase of armour, intending to reduce the Estimates, without presenting a supplementary Estimate, but we thought that a subsequent application of money such as this should be put into a supplementary Estimate. We have accordingly taken that course, and the Estimate will be laid before the House before many days are over. There is only one other item in connection with expenditure to which I should like to refer briefly, and herein I am pursuing the same course in office as I pursued in opposition. I have always insisted on the supreme importance of Vote 8, the great shipbuilding Vote, and especially that portion which refers to what is called new construction. Perhaps I may explain that. By new construction we mean the money expended on the building of new ships of any kind whatever, no matter when commenced. The new programme is that which commences this year. New construction is the running programme which may have been commenced one, two, or three years ago. Vote 8 dominates all the Navy Estimates. If you allow that to rise, every other Vote is bound to rise, and I would ask leave to give the House some figures showing the progress of the provision made for new construction in the last eleven years. In the first of these years, 1895–96, the provision for new construction—and here I include everything voted by supplementary as well as by the orginal Estimates—was £5,393,000. It rose the next year by £2,000,000 to rather more than £7,000,000. Then it dropped again to £6,641,000, but bolted up again the next year to £7,600,000, and in the following year to £8,855,000. It fell a little the next year, to £8,460,000, rising again in 1901–2 to £9,000,000, standing practically at that amount in 1902–3, and rising again in 1903–4 to £10,136,000, or nearly double what it was in 1895–96. Then comes the great culminating year of 1904–5, when the provision for new construction rose to the prodigious total of £11,654,000. Last year, however, the provision was only £9,500,000, and this year it is a little less—that is to say about £9,250,000. But I am afraid, in spite of the reduction, this year it will fluctuate in the neighbourhood of £9,500,000. I take it that the present provision carries us back pretty much to the years 1901, 1902, and 1903. It is a reversion, at all events, to something very near the figures of that period. Assuming it is a reversion to the two-Power standard—I used to think that the two-Power standard had been exceeded in some of the years in which the high water mark of the figures was reached—assuming that that is so, and that the new construction Vote this year invites the House to provide a normal and not an abnormal figure, I want to put the House in possession of my forecast of the naval expenditure of the future on that basis. Assuming that new construction is to stand about where it is now, assuming that Vote 10, which is a very speculative and uncertain Vote, will not greatly exceed the provision made this year—making these two great assumptions, the rest becomes a calculation which is practically automatic. We have the sum of £9,500,000 for new construction and a reduced expenditure for the present year of something like £1,500,000. I am assuming that that state of things is to continue, and that no advance is to be made in new construction and works. Then you will see what the effect of the automatic process will be. By automatic process I mean this. There are certain Votes which must rise in consequence of what we have done in the past, and one of them is Vote 10 for works. The annuity for the payment of loans is this year, in respect of principal and interest, something like £1,000,000. I propose to take payment for five years only. By the end of five years that provision will have risen to £1,500,000. And there are other non-effective Votes which will rise in the same way. An increase in the number of ships, an increase in manning, carries with it at no very distant date an increase in the non-effective charges. Taking this year the gross Estimates at £33,575,000, next year, 1907–8, we may calculate that the Naval Vote would be £34,240,000. In 1908–9, I am told, on this calculation, we shall be close upon £35,000,000; the next year, 1909–10, £35,226,000; and in the year 1910–11, £35,400,000. There is no increase in Vote 10 and Vote 8, and assuming the result will be what I have already described we shall be committed to Navy Estimates exceeding the present Estimates by £2,000,000 or £3,500,000. I do not wish to indulge in these speculations with a view to challenging the past policy, but I have always thought it right that the House of Commons should know, and if possible that the country should know, what it is paying for this great and most important of our public services. I have always dwelt upon the growing expenditure of the Navy, and have always said that we were always obliged to go on increasing that expenditure, but that it was possible to aim at some lower figure.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Please turn round. We cannot hear you.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I want the House to consider by way of justification, if you like, by way of fair play, if you like, what the increase in the world's naval burden has been in the last ten years. These figures have no official authority; they are estimated figures, not actual expenditure. I have taken three years. In 1894 the naval expenditure of Europe and America—I leave out Japan — amounted to £48,500,000, including Great Britain. In 1899 that expenditure had risen by £20,000,000—to £68,500,000. It then began to alarm the world, and the consequence was the summoning of the Hague Conference, which had for its main, its capital, its prime purpose to reduce by agreement the growing and colossal burden of naval expenditure. The Hague Conference expired with the pious expression on its lips that the greatest service the nations could render to humanity would be to combine together to carry out this reduction. Those were the last dying words and testament of the Hague Conference. What has happened since? In the succeeding five years the Naval expenditure of Europe and America has risen from £68,500,000 to £101,500,000. In other words, since the Hague Conference made its suggestion there has been an addition of 50 per cent. to the naval burden of the world. I am not saying that by way of blame. All those who contributed to that expenditure—and all the world pretty well was in it—must share the blame equally.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorks, Sowerby) asked whether it was not the fact that this country was responsible for more than half of the increase.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I should think it is quite possible, but I have not the figures.

*Sir HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): Did you not say that the increase in our Naval expenditure was £11,000,000 in eleven years?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Our increase was a great deal more than that. Our expenditure rose from £20,000,000 gross in 1895–96 to £38,000,000 in 1904–5, not counting the expenditure on new loan works at all. Perhaps I may be allowed, in conclusion, to read two or three sentences which, I believe, express the feeling entertained by both sides of the House as to the evil, it may be the necessary evil, of these great armaments. They are the words spoken by the Prime Minister at the great meeting in the Albert Hall. He said—

> "I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world. A policy of huge armaments keeps alive and stimulates and feeds the belief that force is the best, if not the only solution of international differences. It is a policy that tends to inflame old sores, and to create new sores. And I submit to you that as the principle of peaceful arbitration gains ground it becomes one of the highest tasks of a statesman to adjust those armaments to the newer and happier condition of things. What nobler *role* could this great country assume than at the fitting moment to place itself at the head of a league of peace through whose instrumentality this great work could be effected?"

With these words of the Prime Minister I shall conclude what I have to say, and beg to thank the House for the patient hearing which they have given to me.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said that the right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by asking the House to sympathise with him in the difficult position in which he was placed by having to defend these Estimates at such short notice. He hoped the House would also extend a share of its sympathy to him for having to deal, at equally short notice, with the Statement which the First Lord of the Admiralty had circulated with the Estimates. Although he was, it was true, at the Admiralty when these Estimates were framed in bulk he had only had an opportunity of seeing them in private within the last few hours. That difficulty sprang from causes over which neither side of the House had any control, and therefore he hoped the indulgence of the House would be extended both to the right hon. Gentleman and to himself. If he understood the Secretary to the Admiralty aright he appeared rather to wash his hands of responsibility with regard to these Estimates, and desired to throw the burden of expounding and defending them upon those who were associated with the late Admiralty Board. He thought that was a somewhat novel and unconstitutional position. The right hon. Gentleman spoke about having been in office only a few weeks or days, but his impression was that he had been in office a little longer than that—in fact, it was nearly three months.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: But I could not do any work until after the election.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said that electioneering work was not usually considered to be any excuse for not doing the business of the Admiralty, but he did not wish to press that point. But the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues were responsible for these Estimates. Their signatures appeared upon them, and therefore he did not think they had any right to throw upon their predecessors the burden of expounding them.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: My suggestion was that we should share it.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said they were prepared to share it. If the Estimates for which the late Government were responsible were attacked, he should be glad to co-operate with the right hon. Gentleman in defending them, if he was in need of his assistance. At any rate they would wait until the attack developed. Their position on the Opposition Benches with regard to Naval policy could easily be defined, for they regarded it as non-contentious and non-Party, and in this particular case they would naturally be only too willing to support Estimates and a policy which they had themselves initiated and elaborated, and the main structure of which was completed before they left office. When the right hon. Gentleman pleaded want of time as an excuse for not committing himself or his colleagues to an approval of a policy which the late Government initiated, he perhaps might be allowed to express a wish that another State Department, namely the Colonial Department, had shown similar prudence in dealing with problems of vast importance in South Africa, of which the Prime Minister had said they were wofully ignorant. If the Government proposed to continue and maintain the broad outlines of naval policy which had been handed over to them by their predecessors, they would receive from the Opposition every possible support and assistance. But there was a somewhat ominous note in the right hon. Gentleman's speech, when he rather went out of his way to disclaim any responsibility for continuing the policy of the late Government in the future. Of course he was entitled to do so if he liked. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the advantage of continuity of Naval policy at the Admiralty, and mentioned as an illustration that the Sea Lords had been continued in office, describing them as a "nucleus crew," he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would remember that the nucleus crew consisted of the skilled ratings, and that their advice should be followed accordingly, This would necessarily involve continuing the policy which the late Government handed over to their successors. If, on the other hand, the Government decided to modify or to depart from that particular policy, he and his friends would be entitled to ask the reasons, and after having those reasons explained they would of course reserve full liberty of action. There was one point to which the right hon. Gentleman referred in the nature of a change in the Estimates. He was very glad indeed to hear the right hon. Gentleman's statement with regard to Rosyth, because the absence of that item, or rather its excision from the original Estimates, naturally caused some anxiety to those who believed that a naval base at Rosyth was an absolute necessity. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman that there was no intention whatever on the part of the Government to abandon the Rosyth scheme; that, on the contrary, they still regarded it as a feature of vital importance, and that they only found it necessary to reconsider some of the details of the scheme, in view of possible changes of design in warships.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said his words were that the Admiralty had no intention of departing from the scheme of repairing and docking accommodation at Rosyth, because it was of imperative necessity that this should be provided on the East coast, where at present no such accommodation existed.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said he thought that assurance was satisfactory. When the late Government went out of office the policy was to press on Rosyth with all possible speed, and it was indeed anticipated that the main contract would be let by about the 1st June. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman had given reasons for modifying that policy, but so long as the scheme was to be vigorously proceeded with he had no objection to offer. The only other large scheme of new Naval works was at Portsmouth, and he was glad to see from the Estimates that the scheme of the late Government providing for increasing shipbuilding and docking facilities at Portsmouth had been completely adopted, and that provision would be taken for it in this year's Estimates. With regard to the new shipbuilding programme they had been told that the ships would not be laid down till late in 1906. He would like to have an assurance that the delay was not due to any considerations merely of economy, but that it was a question of design.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I think it was your own proposal.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said the designs were very far advanced when he left the Admiralty, and he was surprised to find so great a delay considered necessary, but if he was told the delay was due to difficulties of design he had no more to say.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I did not say that.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: Then it is out of consideration for economy.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I said I did not think anything would be proceeded with before June, and that I inferred from the amount taken for them in the Estimates we are proposing. I think I am right in saying that the whole provision for the new programme is only £645,000.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said that as long as the new programme was not being delayed for the cause he had suggested he had no objection to offer. The right hon. Gentleman said it would be possible later on to give fuller information as to the details of the new programme. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not adopt the policy of giving too much information in regard to the details of designs to the House, and consequently to the outside world. He was aware that last year for the first time the House was asked to accept the principle that it was not desirable that new and novel designs should be made public more than was necessary, and the House assented to that proposition. He hoped that that would constitute a precedent for the future. The right hon. Gentleman expressed a reserve in his mind with regard to the new scheme of education on the point of non-specialisation. He had suggested that the system of non-specialisation was something new, which had not been contemplated when the system was introduced. He assured him that that was not the case. The original scheme distinctly contemplated that there should be non-specialisation, and it was both the intention and the confident hope of its framers that non-specialisation would be ultimately adopted. As regards the general situation, they on the Opposition Benches were of course both earnest and enthusiastic advocates of a strong and indeed an invincible Navy. While in office they translated that advocacy into a definite policy and, a practical realisation. He thought the right hon. Gentleman in reviewing the question of expenditure had not given due weight to what had been accomplished by that expenditure. It had been a unique period of naval development, particularly during the last two years, when a great naval war—the first great naval war of our time—had taught practical lessons which could not possibly have been learned by any other means, and which must necessarily make the mere theories on which they had been bound in the past to proceed of comparatively little value. As the result of that war many of the accepted theories—when he said accepted he meant accepted not only by the Admiralty of this country but accepted by the Admiralties of all countries—had proved to be wrong, and our Admiralty had not been ashamed to own that they had been wrong in some matters, and as the result it had been necessary to effect a practical revolution in naval affairs. The main structure of these great reforms was completed, and the late Government handed over to their successors a Navy which was greater in strength and efficiency, better manned and equipped, better trained and educated in every way, and more ready for instant service than this country had ever in the past had at its disposal. He thought this must be set against the increased expenditure which the right hon. Gentleman, from the purely financial point of view, so justly deplored. The right hon. Gentleman went on to draw his moral that it was highly desirable, not only in the interest of this country, but of the world at large, that this naval expenditure should be reduced, and that we should endeavour to come to an arrangement with foreign countries by which some system of disarmament could be accepted. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted the speech of the Prime Minister at the Albert Hall on that subject. Every sensible individual in this and in other countries was in favour of such an arrangement if it could possibly be effected, but he could not suggest too strongly that it was not the business of this country, which depended for its very existence on its naval supremacy, to commence any such policy of disarmament; but if other countries which did not depend for their existence and for their daily bread on the command of the sea chose to initiate a policy of this kind or make proposals, he was sure that the Government, from whichever Party it might be constituted, would be only too glad to listen to such proposals. But the proposals must come from them, and not from us in the first place. He had no doubt that in the course of the debate there would be many criticisms made on points of detail in these Estimates. No one, he presumed, would contend that there were no opportunities for criticism in such an extended series of proposals; but, after all, what was the true test as to whether the policy which was expressed in the Estimates was a good and right policy and one which ought to be approved by the House of Commons? The only true test of success in naval policy was in the answer to the question, How many ships of complete efficiency according to modern requirements, and manned by thoroughly trained crews, can be put into line of battle at a moment's notice? That was the only true test, because naval war, they had reason to suppose, in future would generally come like a thunder-clap from a blue sky. Applying that test to the present condition of affairs, he asked the House to remember that under the new scheme all ships of any fighting efficiency in the Navy—every ship rated as being of fighting efficiency—was now always ready for active service, and instant battle if necessary. In time of war they would all be manned by active service ratings without any necessity for calling upon the Reserve at all, and the available fighting strength of the Navy had not only been enormously increased but practically doubled in the last few years. That was what the country had got for its money, and he believed it was good value He might conclude by quoting a very striking and impartial opinion upon our new naval policy by a distinguished French statesman, M. Hanotaux, late French Foreign Minister, who, though not recognised particularly as an Anglophile in other directions, was an authority whose opinion carried great weight. He wrote—

> "Hardly had our Government ratified the Anglo-French Agreement than the English Admiralty issued an order for the general re-organisation of the British Fleet and the redistribution of British Naval Forces all over the world. Nothing to compare with it has ever been seen in history. Neither the Romans nor Napoleon ever conceived anything equal to it. England now dominates everywhere. Peace and war are equally under her control. Our neighbouring Power can now calmly await any complications that may arrive. By her recent measures she has set the seal upon her power and greatness."

He thought that was a very high tribute indeed to the Admiralty policy of the late Government, and one which was well deserved. It was on these grounds that he wished to express his satisfaction that the right hon. Gentleman had told the House that the Government did not propose to depart from that policy, or at any rate that that was not their present intention. And if that policy was continued in the future, he could give the right hon. Gentleman the assurance that, from the Opposition Benches, he would receive not only no hostile criticism, but every possible assistance and support.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) congratulated his right hon. friend on the very clear statement he had given to the House that afternoon. The right hon. Gentleman was the first Minister who had, on such an occasion, given a complete estimate of the Naval expenditure for the year. It had always been a subject of complaint that the Naval Estimates had hitherto been presented piecemeal, and that they did not get all the particulars of the expenditure under the Naval Works Loans Acts. He had had the honour of moving last year an Amendment in which regret was expressed that the then Government had not by negotiation with foreign Powers brought about a still further reduction on the Naval Estimates. That Amendment was thought rather out of place, seeing that they were then having a reduction of £3,500,000 on the previous year's Estimates. But the Estimates before the House justified the attitude then taken by him, for they had now, in round figures, a further reduction of £1,500,000, or, altogether, a reduction in two years of £5,000,000. That showed that mere expenditure was no guarantee of efficiency. It was very interesting to consider the expenditure on the Navy since 1899. He did not go farther back than that year, because it was the year before the South African war; and the Estimates for that year were £27,000,000. In six years that amount had increased to £38,000,000. Those who then sat on the Opposition side of the House criticised the expenditure as unnecessary. Well, the result had been a reduction of £5,000,000, while the Navy had been rendered more efficient. This reduction had been brought about by a redistribution of the Fleet, with increased efficiency. He noticed in the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty a paragraph showing that the system adopted last year had got rid of every obsolete vessel and all obsolete ammunition. He did not know whether it had been said in a sarcastic spirit by the First Lord of the Admiralty, but he did say that a large quantity of ammunition which had become obsolete for Naval purposes had either been disposed of or had been handed over to the War Office. He understood that this ammunition might be suitable for War Office purposes; but the principle adopted of getting rid of everything obsolete was the right principle. He must confess that he could not follow the right hon. Gentleman in his proposition to deal with the very large expenditure for the completion of the naval base at Rosyth. He had witnessed with some amusement the extreme virtue of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer when the Secretary to the Admiralty stated that there was to be no more expenditure under the Naval Works Loans Act. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer took all the advantage of that system by postponing payment and making his Estimates for the year appear really less than they were; and now the right hon. Gentleman posed on the floor of the House as the apostle of financial purity. His right hon. friend the Member for Dundee was to be congratulated on his determination to carry out in office the views he had expressed in Opposition. However, he put it that even the present Estimates of £33,000,000 for the Navy were excessive, and he would urge that the Government ought, by negotiation with foreign Powers, to endeavour to come to some understanding in regard to naval expenditure. He had been rather disappointed at the statement of the hon. Gentleman opposite, the late Civil Lord, who said that it was not the business of this country to initiate negotiations for a general arrest of naval armaments.

*Mr. ARTHUR LEE said he meant that this country should not initiate a policy of disarmament—not initiate negotiations for disarmament.

*Mr. McCRAE said he would accept the hon. Gentleman's correction. But Great Britain was the greatest Naval nation in the world, and it was essentially our part to take the initial step. The hon. Member would remember that Lord Goschen made a statement to that effect some years ago; and he asked whether the late Government had ever made any attempt whatever to enter into negotiations with foreign Powers. Subsequent to the discussion on the question in this House, there was a debate in the French Chamber, in which the members of that great assembly reciprocated a wish for the initiation of negotiations for the purpose indicated. He hoped his right hon. friend would initiate his new period of office by making an attempt to bring about some reduction in the Naval armaments of all the Great Powers.

*Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) said he regretted that the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty had been somewhat colourless, especially in regard to the training of the future officers for the Royal Navy. It had been pointed out that there had been considerable reductions in the Vote for new construction. But the right hon. Gentleman had insisted that new construction ruled the whole of the rest of the Vote, including *personnel*. Now, in war time the waste of material was in excess of that of *personnel* and it was not, therefore, necessary to man all the ships built. There was an idea that we should initiate negotiations in regard to the reduction of Naval armaments. He believed that there would be no success in these negotiations. In fact, the result of the last negotiation for that suggested purpose had been a considerable increase in Naval armaments all round. Great Britain would lay herself open to some such retort as had been given to her by Napoleon III., who said—

> "You ought to be twice as strong as I am; and each of us can look after our own business."

If a Committee or Commission was formed to negotiate for the reduction of Naval armaments this country would be liable to put her maritime policy under the domination of foreigners. They were all indignant at putting our sugar policy under the domination of foreigners by the Brussels Convention; but that resentment would be stronger were we to put our Naval policy under the domination of foreigners. The present Admiralty scheme for training officers was issued just forty-eight hours before the late Government left office, and therefore the present Government was in no way responsible for it. The change involved a revolution in the officering of our Navy. The Selborne scheme provided for a common source of supply; a common system of entry; a common system of training up to twenty, and then permanent separation. But one did not make a scheme democratic, as it had been called, by making it have a common system of entry. If that were so they would have to allow that the House of Lords was a democratic institution, because there was a common avenue of entry into it. The scheme, so far from being democratic, went quite in the other direction and made the conditions very much worse. The education of engineering cadets cost a father about £50 a year and entry was by open competition. He had a question on the Paper addressed to the Secretary to the Admiralty, and he should be very much surprised to hear if the expenses of the cadets at Osborne under a system of nomination were less than £120 a year, a price which was very undemocratic, because it excluded nine-tenths of the nation from being Naval officers. Under such a scheme no Nelson and no St. Vincent could have entered the service, because their fathers could not have afforded the fees. The system was like the Royal Yacht promotions, inconsistent with democratic ideals, and it was something which the Liberal Party ought to do away with. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee denounced the scheme when it was introduced, in strong terms, and so also did the Prime Minister, in very strong language indeed, for he said it was a state of things "not to be contemplated for a moment." He had had letters from schoolmasters and Admirals from which he gathered that their experience led them to be dead against the scheme. One schoolmaster wrote—

> "From the experience I have had so far I can only assume that social position and political influence have far more to do with the granting of nominations for general ability or fitness for the service."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon pointed out that there would be no lack of engineer candidates, but two and a-half years later they found Lord Cawdor stating that—

> "It can hardly be expected, nor is it right to expect, that even a small proportion will volunteer for a specialist engineering branch."

Therefore, a change was made by which if the occupant of the bridge was killed, the engineer who had been below came up and took charge on the bridge. This was the case although he might have been ten years below decks. So we got the officer who was going to be able to do everything. He was to be the fighting officer with guns or torpedoes, the signalling officer with flags and wireless telegraphy, the navigating officer, the tactician, the judge on Courts martial, the engineer with turbines, reciprocating engines and a multitude of water tube boilers. Now it was added that he was to be marine officer, able to direct troops on shore as well as to take charge of ships afloat. Was it to be wondered at that the Navy afloat was in a large majority against this scheme. This was accounted for by the fact that in the first place the Board did not pretend that they had consulted the man of experience afloat. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon said on March 4th, 1903—

> "The first Lord sent a copy of his memorandum at the time of issue to all the Admirals

in command of foreign stations. There was no necessity to consult them on the new scheme before its adoption, as the Board of Admiralty, from the nature of its constitution, is fully competent to act on its own initiative."

He would, however, point out to the House that a few months before the right hon. Gentleman introduced that scheme he said that the Sea Lords had no time to think out the problems connected with this work. Lord Selborne, only a few months before the introduction of the scheme, had inquired of officers, amongst whom must have been Sir John Fisher, whom the noble Lord met in the Mediterranean, and then he made a speech in which he said he acted on—

> "The authority of admirals and captains fresh from the sea,"

in saying that—

> "So far as the personnel goes, it is scarcely possible to improve the officers or the men. They say with extraordinary unanimity that subject to some improvements in detail, the general system of training young officers and seamen leaves nothing to be desired."

If that was the case, why revolutionise the whole system under which the Navy was officered? Yet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon said—

> "The changes are being made not spasmodically, not as the result of a whim or sudden inspiration or in the individual opinions of any individual member, but as the result of the combined counsel of the Admiralty."

The Times said that Lord Selborne's change was carried unanimously by the Board of Admiralty, but as he understood it there were one naval and two civilian members against three naval members. He did not believe it would be possible to get a statement from the other naval members of the Board of Admiralty that they were in favour of the scheme—at any rate in favour of the scheme as it stood now. The one naval member was Sir John Fisher, who was only saved from compulsory retirement by the regulations being set aside by a special Order in Council. If that had not been done the chances were that they would have another naval officer on the Board reversing the policy which was being carried out. As it was, however, they had this policy of Lord Cawdor, and the House would note the difference of treatment Sir John Fisher meted out to himself and to others, as 4,000 artificers were ruthlessly, remorselessly, and relentlessly swept out of what they were entitled to and deprived of their best positions as the watch keepers of the Navy. The Admiralty had one law for the artificer and another for the Admiral. They had had a flag list two-thirds of the members of which were doing nothing and it was increased by an addition of one Admiral of the Fleet in order to give Sir John Fisher a fresh lease of life. There appeared to be one law for the quarter-deck and another for the lower; one law for the Admirals and another for the artificers. Although the latter were doing their work excedingly well they were to be remorselessly swept out. The Admiralty had justified this last reversal of the law of specialisation by certain statistics. They said—

> "Since the first two years of the training of cadets under the new system has now been completed, an estimate can be formed of what the attainments of these officers will be at the end of their sea training as midshipmen."

And again they said—

> "Now that sufficient experience of the working of the new system has been obtained, it is desirable that definite regulations for future procedure, with regard to the allocation of officers, to the various branches of the service should be formulated and promulgated at the earliest possible moment."

The experience they had obtained was two years in regard to boys between twelve and a-half and fourteen and a-half years. The Admiralty, which was Sir John Fisher, did better than Cæsar. They taught these children mechanics for four and a-half months, and then said that they knew they were going to be able to handle ships as engines in war twenty years hence. They had heard to-day that they could watch and wait, but he denied that that was the case, for all this time the officers who were going to be placed in responsible positions ten years hence were being trained to be jacks-of-all-trades and universal experience showed that they would be masters of none. Why was it undesirable that men who understood machinery should run engines and that men who understood navigating ships should go down and run engines? One reason he believed why the Admiralty had carried out this step was that there was a very strong engineering agitation to which about sixty Members of the House subscribed some years ago, and it seemed to him that this hostility to the artificers was an attack upon the trades unions which the artificers had the wisdom to join before they entered the Navy. An admiral who was well informed had written a letter of which he had a copy. It ran—

> "The ships are certain to go back and have defects increased enormously by this new plan, first, the engine-room artificer will not be in a position to prevent wear and tear which he would by keeping watch, and secondly when the ship goes into harbour there will be only half the engine-room artificers to undertake artificers' work. The whole thing is ludicrously theoretical and absolutely unworkable."

In answer to a question the other day they were told that protests had been received from officers of the Fleet. It was a long time since in the Navy we had had protests addressed to the Board of Admiralty about its policy. There was a protest about 114 years ago, addressed by Lord Hood about Admiralty policy and he was superseded. No action had been taken in this case, and he found that Lord Selborne in his annual statement for 1902–3, writing of the old system, said that, judged by its results and the excellence of the officers turned out under it, it was a good one. Why change it? The change was introduced when Sir John Fisher joined the Board of Admiralty, and then changes were brought in which Lord Selborne described as "far-reaching and in some respects sweeping." In his view the gentlemen who were associated with Sir John Fisher on the Board were simply there for ornamental purposes. The fact was that the Admiralty had been for some time past a one man show with Sir John Fisher running it. The present state of things showed room for improvement. Neither engineers nor executive officers knew their job. We had now numerous collisions and other catastrophes. A return which had been issued showed that there had been three collisions and groundings per fortnight in 1904. Were they likely to diminish that number of collisions and groundings by sending officers down to do engine-room duties? Again, when right hon. Gentlemen opposite were at the Admiralty, we had numerous breakdowns in the engine-room. That was when we had the water tube boiler scare, of which the House heard a great deal. The only way the Government got over the water tube boiler business was by training the officers for their proper job. That was what we should do now. The present scheme was being hotly opposed by engineers and by the engineering Press. Such papers as *Engineering* had gone strongly against the scheme, and at the conclusion of one of his leading articles the editor of the last-named journal had to go back to the days of his childhood for a simile. After riddling the scheme with shot and bursting shell words failed him, and he said of this "wonderland" scheme—

> "Mother, I want to learn to swim,"
> "Oh yes, my charming daughter;
> Hang your clothes on a gooseberry bush,
> But don't go near the water."

It was impossible to train officers in engineering by teaching them seamanship. One had to teach them to take their coats off and to do their work in the engine room. The practical experience of the whole world was against this idea of making officers jacks-of-all-trades and masters of none, which they all knew was the result of any such attempt. All over the globe every thoughtful person was in favour of specialisation. In the mercantile marine the man who navigated the vessel was quite distinct from the man who worked in the engine room. The Japanese Navy tried the experiment for four and a half years and abandoned it as impracticable. This system was introduced in the United States Navy about eight years ago, and the result had been an utter failure. Three years ago Admiral Melville, engineer-in-chief, reported that officers who had been trained in professional engineering work would lose interest, aptitude, confidence, and even efficiency in engineering duties, if they were allowed to specialise in other directions. He said that engineering efficiency was "rapidly decreasing." But there was even a more recent verdict of the engineer-in-chief of the United States. The new engineer-in-chief reported last-year that so long as the older officers of the former engineer corps remained available for service at sea, supplemented by the new body of officers styled machinists, the engineering duty of the Fleet was satisfactorily performed. He, however, rubbed in a good deal of candid criticism. He said—

> "So few officers of the line are taking up engineering seriously that the situation is becoming alarming. That the Department must do something to relieve this situation, and do that something at once, is only too obvious to the most casual observer of present conditions. Were the country suddenly plunged into war, the Navy would find itself in no condition to win battles. As necessary as good marksmanship is the ability to carry our guns to the firing line, and to keep them there amidst the havoc created by modern ordinance, and this will never be done with amateurs in charge of the machinery."

He wanted to know whether this House was willing to sanction a scheme, without further inquiry, which was likely to bring about the same state of affairs in the British Navy as now existed in the United States Navy. The admirers in the United States of the scheme which he was criticising were falling away one by one. Mr. Long, who was at the head of the Navy when this scheme of a fighting engineer was introduced, now prophesied that the machinist—that was our engine-room artificer—would become the future engineer officer. Because some of them who wrote for the Press did not believe in these changes and stuck to the old fashioned belief that a jack-of-all-trades was master of none they were called antediluvians, and were told they ought to be scrap-heaped by a masterly stroke of the pen, and that the great Sir John ought to put them in the Yarmouth naval lunatic asylum. But if that were attempted he was afraid that Sir John Fisher would have to sweep away most of the flag list of the Navy. They wanted continuity of policy. Sooner or later they would have to recruit their Board with fresh blood, and then what happened to their policy? Because he wanted continuity of policy, he advocated inquiry. In his opinion, therefore, the best thing this House could do was to order a Committee of Inquiry, consisting of three impartial men, who would examine into the precise scope and effect of these revolutionary memoranda which had been introduced by Lord Selborne and Lord Cawdor. If such a Committee saw any advantage in the scheme then hostile critics like himself would cease to oppose it.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds) said that among all the speeches which had been made during the general election by hon. Members he believed that in most cases the Navy was left out in the cold. They had just heard a very able statement from the Secretary to the Admiralty, from which it appeared that no less than £34,000,000 was going to be devoted to the Navy this year. He thought that in English politics it would be very much better that the Navy should hold a bigger place than it did at present. No doubt hon. Members opposite in their platform speeches used that very striking phrase, "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." A splendid text to preach upon, from a Naval point of view. The other night the President of the Local Government Board said that what this country really wanted was peace. How was peace to be retained? That which was most likely to ensure peace in this country was a strong Navy. If we had a strong Navy there was not the slightest question but that the nations about us would respect our rights. If we had a sufficiency of force at our back, he was quite certain that we should find our position to be what it ought to be in the Councils of Europe. What did Nelson say when it came to a question of dealing with foreign nations? He said, and his speech was one which ought to be posted up everywhere, that there was no better negotiator in the Councils of Europe than a fleet of English line of battleships. He should like to have heard the Secretary to the Admiralty, in reference to the question of continuity of policy, confirm the principle which had been laid down for a great many years past, that our armoured vessels should be equal in number to the armoured vessels of any two foreign Powers. He believed that at the present moment we stood in a good position, but it was not for us to sit down and simply admire our strength. It was for us to say how in the future we intended to keep that strength up to the standard to which it had been brought in recent years. He understood, however, that the Board of Admiralty had laid it down that they were only going to increase the Navy by four new armoured ships each year. They had not said whether those ships were to be armoured cruisers or battleships. He did not quarrel with the Admiralty at the present time for not defining the class of ships, but he thought that the number of ships to be laid down and the necessities of the case should be carefully scrutinised. He believed that at the present time we were up to the two-Power standard which had always been laid down as the proper point at which the Navy should be kept. He hoped they should not find that, as time went on, owing to the pressure for economy which was apparently being brought upon the Admiralty, there were attempts to reduce our armaments below the standard he had named. He had calculated the position as far as he could with the assistance of a great many experts. He understood that at the present moment the Admiralty considered that the life of one of our big armoured ships was not more than about fifteen years. If, therefore, we had to consider our position from the point of view of the two-Power standard we must take that consideration into view. Up to 1904 the fleets of two great nations had been considered as the two against whom we should have to calculate our figures, viz., France and Russia. Owing to the great defeat that Russia suffered at the hands of another nation a little time ago, Russia no longer had the naval position that she formerly had. He believed that the fleets we had now to consider to test the two-Power standard were those of France and Germany. If France and Germany carried out their respective programmes of shipbuilding up to the year 1919, and we only increased our fleet by four armoured vessels a year, Great Britain would then have sixty-three armoured ships of not more than 15 years old, France would have thirty-three, and Germany thirty-five. Therefore on that year we should be five ships to the bad. That was not a position which we should contemplate with equanimity. So much for peace. We ought to be strong, and we ought to see that the defences of the country were strong and kept up to the mark. The next point was retrenchment. That was a very excellent thing so long as it did not impair efficiency. Through carefully building up in recent years we now possessed a fleet in good order; we had the men ready and were in the position at which we had been aiming. It was necessary to see that we did not go down from that position. In order to effect what was called retrenchment and efficiency the late Board of Admiralty brought in a scheme by which 150 vessels, mostly small, old, or of little fighting value, were practically put upon the scrap heap. They had come to the conclusion that, owing to the alteration in fighting arrangements, a number of ships which from time immemorial had done various duties, not always of a strictly naval character, should be removed from the active list and dispensed with. This Act secured efficiency and retrenchment. Those 150 ships had been absorbing the time of many good men and costing an immense amount of money in upkeep and repairs, and in time of war the great difficulty would have been to get them safely into a British port. Diplomatic troubles often came very swiftly, and in case hostilities broke out many of those 150 ships would have had a poor chance in fighting against the improved ships of our enemies, and consequently they were a source of weakness. Besides this they were keeping good men bottled up in them who ought to be manning the vast number of ships in the reserve. What had revolutionised the Navy was that these ships had now been put upon the scrap heap, their crews had been taken out of them re-organised, and all the efficient men in them had been put into ships in the reserve and were now ready at a moment's notice to go to sea. That was a thing which the Navy had been hoping against hope for for years, and now it was an accomplished fact. There were a vast number of ships in commission, and all the ships strong enough for the fighting line were now ready to go to sea. The Board of Admiralty were thoroughly awake, in fact they never had a more efficient Board than at the present time. The hon. Member for King's Lynn said he hoped a Committee would be appointed to inquire into certain subjects, and he suggested that three gentlemen should inquire as to what the Board of Admiralty were doing. Was it right that there should be in this Kingdom three men whose opinions they were ready to take as against those of the most efficient Admirals in the *Navy List?* What use would such a Committee be?

MR. BELLAIRS: What I said was that there was a strong difference of opinion amongst the Admirals, and therefore a Committee was necessary in order to get their opinions.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY said that if the Admirals on the Board of Admiralty were not the best men they ought to get others. It was no good having a Board of Admiralty composed of the best men who had got all the information possible from every source, and then appoint a Committee to set up their opinions against the Board of Admiralty which was supposed to be composed of expert opinion. He thought they were quite safe in trusting the Board of Admiralty to do what was right. As far as continuity of policy was concerned in the future when other officers had to take up this scheme they would find that a master hand had had the running of the show; they would find that it had been started upon right lines, and they would have very little difficulty in carrying out the present policy. There were some other things in connection with efficiency in regard to these Estimates which he should like to see carried into effect. He had heard them described as bloated Estimates, but they were bloated with things which he did not think ought to have anything at all to do with the Board of Admiralty. He noticed amongst the Estimates such things as cost of protection of fisheries, sums of money for astronomical observatories, and Votes for coast-guards. Such things as those ought not to be put upon the Navy Estimates. The highly trained men of the Navy ought not to be employed looking after fisheries; such work could be done by a proper system of merchant ships not under the Admiralty. The same might be said of the astronomical business. It was a good thing to know what the sun and the moon were made of, but such things were of no special practical benefit to the Navy, and therefore they should not be placed on the Navy Estimates. The same argument would apply to the coast-guards, who had to board ships from foreign ports and perform other duties which might very well be relegated to a totally different department, and thus leave the Navy Estimates solely for what was required for the actual service of the Navy as a fighting machine. With regard to the question of the system of training and entry of officers, criticism had moulded the policy of the Admiralty. They had not tied themselves too rigidly to the position which they had taken up in 1902, and he thought they ought to have a free hand in dealing with a question of this kind, so that they might modify the system in detail if they desired. But why was it necessary to have this alteration in the system in question? Because the necessities of the personnel of the Navy had quite altered from what they were in the olden days. Some fifty years ago steam was introduced, and with that had gradually come engineers of the very highest type whom all respected and admired. They had reasons for wishing certain reforms in their class, but so long as they remained engineers pure and simple it was difficult for any satisfactory arrangements to be arrived at which would grant what the engineers wanted; and consequently the whole system had to be put into the melting pot and a new one evolved. The basis of the new system was that in the Navy of the present day it was essential that every executive officer, no matter what grade he might belong to, should have to a large extent an engineer's training. The ships in the Navy at the present time were a bunch of tricks; there were so many different engines and persons responsible that it was absolutely necessary not that the present engineers should be executive officers but that the future executive officers should all be engineers. There had been the class difficulty to get over, not because of the present engineers, who were such as all officers would be glad to meet on equal terms as well on shore as on board ship, as he knew from practical experience, but there was that difficulty of class—a prejudice much more pronounced in the country than ever was the case in the ship. That prejudice had spread and made difficulties in getting engineers into the service. To obviate this a totally different training had been resorted to for the engineers the outcome of which was the new system of training and entry. The difficulty had also been mentioned between the engine-room artificers and the stokers in the Navy, and the question of trades unions had been introduced into the debate. He held most strongly that trades unions were not wanted and ought to have no place on board ship in His Majesty's Navy. A ship was a place where there ought to be a common good feeling between the men, such a feeling as had resulted in the British sailor being called the handy man, because he was ready to take any job in any place wherever he went, and was not afraid by doing that job of taking the bread out of the mouth of the man alongside him. The scheme in working out the naval programme should be to enter these artificers in such a way that from the beginning of their service they should be dependent on the Navy and not on trades unions. The engine-room artificers were a most excellent body of men and a splendid lot of workmen. They were entered for duty in certain specific trades, but not in any way as efficient watch-keepers. The whole of that part of the business was learnt on board ship. There were perhaps two trades—the boiler-maker and the engine-fitter—which had some connection with the running of engines, but the other trades had practically nothing to do with the running of engines. The stokers were a body of men thoroughly good at their job now, and had been highly trained, and they numbered about 30,000 as against about 4,000 engine-room artificers. They had as much right to be considered for promotion as the engine-room artificers and there was no reason why they should not prove efficient for engine-room watch-keeping. It had been stated that the engine-room artificers were to be done away with ruthlessly and remorselessly by a stroke of the pen, but there was no intention of doing anything of the sort. Stokers were to be brought into line by making them watch-keepers, and then they were to take the places, as opportunity came, of the present engine-room artificers. That was the form which this remorseless scheme had taken at the present time. Up to now the stokers had had no opportunity of rising to warrant rank, because there were no big billets to put them into. The present scheme of the Admiralty was to give them the opportunity, and it was in no way contended that the artificer should suffer in consequence of the stoker getting such promotion. These stokers, after they had been properly trained in the engine-room to run engines and work at boilers, were properly skilled workmen as much as the engine-room artificers, and he could not therefore agree with the objection that had been raised to the scheme that the artificers as a skilled labour class resented being placed under men who were not skilled. He believed the scheme would be for the good of the service, and he hoped nothing would be done which would tend in any way to minimise the good effect of it.

MR. J. WILLIAMS BENN (Devonport) said he did not claim to be a naval expert, but he desired to offer a few commonplace observations as a dockyard Member. First of all as a dockyard Member he felt himself to be under a great obligation to his right hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty for the most admirable statement he had made. He was glad that that statement indicated a continuity of the Naval policy of the country, and although the right hon. Gentleman did not pledge himself to an endorsement of the new policy, he understood he was prepared to give it a fair trial, and from the figures he gave he gathered that the policy of the new administration was the policy of a strong and efficient Navy. But there was one thing in the new policy which up to now had given grave concern to the dockyard Members. The right hon. Gentleman did not inform the House what proportion would be allocated to the Royal dockyards and what to private yards when he told the House what sum of money would be spent in construction. Documents recently issued seemed to show that the Royal dockyards were to take a second position with regard to this expenditure. They were really to be starved in order that the great private dockyards of the country might be kept going. He had nothing to say against the private dockyards, which he believed to be a valuable national asset, but it was the first duty of the Government to keep their own dockyards fully employed before considering the question of giving work to outside contractors. Those outside contractors could gather work from all parts of the world. He desired to draw attention to the words in official documents which had caused some of the dockyard Members very grave anxiety. In the Memorandum which Lord Selborne issued a year ago he said—

> "Henceforth it should be borne in mind that the first business of the Royal dockyards is to keep the fleet in repair, and accordingly the amount of new construction allotted to those dockyards should be subordinated to this main consideration."

That seemed to show that the intention at all events of the last Administration was to turn our dockyards into repairing shops rather than into places of construction. That fear was further confirmed by Lord Cawdor's statement in November last that—

> "the elimination of the older vessels which require most frequent overhauling and repair greatly reduces the work of the dockyards, and therefore allows a reorganisation of the labour conditions."

On the top of that there was the Memorandum issued this morning, in which Lord Tweedmouth said—

> "Owing to changes in the organisation of the fleet the amount of repairing work in the dockyards has been substantially reduced."

Their concern arose from the fear that the dockyards were to be turned into repairing shops. How were the people they represented to be kept in employment if that was the policy? He thought they would find in this policy the reason for the discharges which had caused so great trouble at the dockyard centres. He asked for information in regard to this policy, and especially what portion of the money was to be allocated to the national workshops. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if this was to be the policy of the Admiralty the distress already existing in dockyard centres would be greatly accentuated, because these Government establishments had attracted large numbers of workmen, and if they were to be thrown out of work by a "stroke of the pen," as the late Prime Minister would say, it would be difficult for them to obtain employment, because they did not happen to be in districts where shipbuilding obtained. By way of illustration he would mention a case that occurred in his own constituency. Prior to the introduction of this policy forty-six trained workmen were engaged in certain parts of the dockyard, and of these eighteen were young men who had been brought up to this particular branch of industry. When this policy was instituted all these men were thrown out of employment. At the present time the eighteen young men, who had secured considerable success in their examinations, were doing labourers' work. Being employed in Government dockyards, they could not take the precaution of joining a trade union —he understood they could not—and therefore if they went to other towns where their services might be required they would have considerable difficulty in finding employment. That instance showed the hardship involved in this change of policy to many of those who had been in the Government employment. With regard to labour, were they to have a declaration that the Government was prepared to abide by the condition that the trade union rate of wages should be paid in the Government departments? He thought it was time that they had a clear declaration on that point.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now anticipating an Amendment. It is not fair to the hon. Member who has put the Amendment down.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS BENN said that under these circumstances he would refrain from any further observations on that point. The dockyard Members heretofore had had the very great advantage of meeting year after year the First Lord of the Admiralty and the leading officials in order to discuss matters of general policy, and he hoped a promise would be given by the right hon. Gentleman that this very useful custom would be continued. Many of the matters which concerned the dockyard employees might be thrashed out in that informal way.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he would not like to let this debate pass without saying a word or two with regard to the speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn. He did not agree with the hon. Gentleman in his conclusions, and he very greatly regretted the arguments by which he thought fit to enforce them. He had made an attack upon the members of the Board of Admiralty which was, he thought, undeserved, and which he did not believe was in accordance with the general sentiment of the House or the public outside the House. The hon. Member had spoken of the First Sea Lord as an officer who had apparently been unwisely retained in the position he occupied, and he pointed out as a bad example that he should have been allowed to remain on the flag list. He himself did not think that condemnation of that kind was the reward which should be given to an officer who had devoted so much of his time and energy to the service of his country. He found but one note running through the hon. Member's speech. It was a personal one. At the back of every generalisation was a personal note of animosity against an individual. The example had been cited of an admiral who wrote minutes questioning the decision of the Board and was told to haul down his flag. He did not know that that was a very bad example. It certainly had had a very good effect, but, whether that were so or not, he thought the general sense of the Navy would be that it was not desirable or expedient that admirals should make their views known in this House through Members of Parliament when they had a clear course prescribed to them in the regulations, and that was to approach the Board of Admiralty. He did not agree with the matter or the manner of the hon. Member's indictment. The hon. Member told them that great changes were being made, and he invited the House to condemn those changes. He asked why changes should be made at all. The answer was very clear. All was changing in the Navy, and if we did not change the organisation of the *personnel* the most important part of the Navy must fall behind. Some of these changes had already been made, and we could see their results. One had not yet been completed, and the hon. Member's indictment was against that one. He hoped the House would judge of the tree by its fruits. Was it not a fair thing to say that a policy which, wherever they had been able to judge by results, had been an extraordinary and undeniable success, was one which should receive their confidence? What had been the result of these changes so far? They had not only revolutionised the Navy, but had reduced the cost by between £5,000,000 and £6,000,000 by getting rid of that which was not fit for war and making efficient what remained. That was not a bad record, and to that economy they had added an enormous increase in efficiency. He thought they might take it that the Board of Admiralty as now constituted marked a new departure, but the hon. Member had asked the House to condemn that portion of the new policy as a failure. He knew perfectly well that there were some officers who did not believe in bringing the engineer officers into line with the executive officers of the Navy. The country, however, he believed, deliberately accepted the idea that the engineer officer should be given the same chance of promotion as any other officer in the ship. That was the end which the present system contemplated, and which, if let alone, it would effect. The hon. Member had said that we were trying to make an officer into a Jack-of-all-trades. That was a mistake It was not a fact that there was any parallel between the system which existed in the United States Navy and that which had now been introduced into the British Navy; and if it were he would point out that the system in the United States Navy was introduced for the same purpose as our own system, though he thought it less calculated to arrive at that result. To cite the case of Japan as an example was simply to mislead the House. The hon. Member said that every other country was opposed to the view of making an officer a Jack-of-all-trades. As a matter of fact every other country was finding the same difficulty which we had experienced with regard to engineer officers. The difficulties in the French Navy in this matter were known to be very great. When he was in the German harbour of Kiel he found that these same questions were being raised in regard to the exclusion of the engineer officer from the highest command in a navy which must daily become more and more of an engineering concern. We in this country had been the first to face the problem and try to find a solution of it, but the problem existed elsewhere. In the French Army at the present moment they were reorganising the training of candidates for the general staff and for the high commands. They were making them serve two years in every branch of the French Army, and yet it would not be supposed that the men would be less effective members of the general staff or commanders because they had served in all these branches. He could well understand that if they accepted all the hon. Member had told them the House might be inclined to believe that this training would be superficial. But that was not so. He would tell the House very briefly what these officers had to learn. A boy went to Osborne at the age of twelve and a-half years, and during the whole of his time there, he was largely engaged in studying the elements of mechanics and engineering. He then went to sea for three years, 30 per cent. of which time was spent on the engine-room watch, while the rest of the time he was employed on the engines. Then he went to learn his trade on shore and went through the engineering and training just as sub-lieutenants went through torpedo and gunnery training. After that, for seven years he must help to take charge of the machinery of a sea-going ship before he was allowed to take charge of the engines of a first-class ship-of-war. He did not see anything to prevent a man taking charge of the engines of a ship-of-war after undergoing a training of that kind. The hon. Member had stated that these officers would have to sit on Courts-martial and take duty as deck officers. What was the case now? An executive officer must be, and was, a member of a Court-martial. He had specialised either in gunnery or torpedo work, but did that unfit him for the duty of command? Fifty per cent. of our captains were specialists. Permanently to exclude the engineer officer from participation in the working of a ship was, in his opinion, a retrograde step of the most unparalleled kind. The hon. Member had spoken of the position of the engine-room artificers and stokers. At the present moment there were 29,000 stokers in the Navy. On the average they had the best character of any class of men in the Navy. They enlisted in the Navy as men, and after fulfilling their time, 20 per cent. of them re-engaged, proving that they were better value than any other class of men. Up to the present there had been no promotion for these men at all. That was not a condition, surely, which hon. Members desired to impose on any man. Every man should have the power to rise in the service to which he belonged. In order to give that power the Admiralty had made a most sensible change. They had said, "We will teach these stokers who have spent their lives in the engine-rooms to run these engines. They are perfectly competent to learn and, if we provide the instruction, they will make themselves masters of the work. When they have so learnt they will be fit to receive warrant rank, and thereby get the promotion to which they are entitled." The engine-room artificers in the Navy numbered about 5,000. Many of them were taken from a great variety of trades which had nothing whatever to do with the driving of great marine engines. They had to be taught as the stokers had to be taught. These men were taken on for the purpose of doing repair work on board ship, and then they were taken away from that work and put on to the engines. What was the most conspicuous feature in the Japanese war? It was that they could repair their ships at sea. Was it not common sense that these men should be allowed to do their own work? They would not be deprived of promotion or of any advantage they might have in the Navy, but they would find that the work of driving engines would be thrown open to them and that they would reach the rank of warrant officer. He would not detain the House on what undoubtedly was a technical question but one which he thought had been raised in a way likely to mislead, and if the House adopted the view put forward it would imperil one of the greatest reforms which had been undertaken for the Navy in past years. He urged hon. Members not to be too hasty in their judgment on the Board of Admiralty. The proof of their work was there for every man to see and test for himself; and because one portion of that work had a personal side which was unpalatable to some persons not members of that Board, they were asked to call that Board of Admiralty to the bar, not to judge it for what it had done, but to impugn its judgment because some discontented persons said, "You must stand at the bar of the House of Commons and account to the House, not for what you have done, but for the effect which we believe your policy will have in future."

*Mr. JENKINS (Chatham) said he wished to call attention to the wages paid and the conditions of employment generally in the Government dockyard and to move a Resolution. For many years representations had been made to the Board of Admiralty by the workmen employed in the dockyards through petition and otherwise in regard to these subjects. He regretted to say, however, that, although many promises had been made—he himself had been present and had listened to the exceedingly pleasant manner in which the chief officials of the Admiralty had replied to the statements of deputations which had waited upon them—nothing had been done in the way of redressing the workmen's grievances. The ordinary labourer in a dockyard at the present time was in receipt of only 20s. a week. He had to pass a medical examination and must look strong and fit before being employed. It was not for him to paint the picture to this House as to what a man could do on 20s. a week; but he ventured to say, as representing a dockyard constituency, that house rent was very dear there and probably absorbed one-third of the labourer's weekly wage. That left him only 13s. 4d. to provide himself and his family with the ordinary necessaries of life. He did not know why it was that the Board of Admiralty had hesitated to yield to the reasonable demands made by these men, who would not be able to perform the arduous work in the dockyard if they had insufficient food. Taking the average number in a labourer's family—whether by Providence or otherwise—at seven there was only 1s. 10¾d. per day to feed and clothe them all, or 3¼d. for each member. Yet when these facts had been pointed out, and appeals had been made to the Admiralty, the Board had absolutely refused to consider what was, in the opinion of the workmen, a fair and honest advance in their wages. Then there was the case of what the Admiralty called the skilled labourer. He was old enough to remember the days when the "wooden walls of England" were built and the class of workman who were employed in building these ships. The Admiralty, however, decided that a large part of the work should be let out, and therefore the labourer was taken in and trained to do skilled or mechanical work, and at the present moment they were doing skilled work of all kinds which when done by mechanics received the highest pay. He complained that although the labourer did this skilled work he did not receive the pay to which he was entitled, which was manifestly unfair. What the Government should do was to delete the word labourer, and if a man was a riveter or a sailmaker he should be called a riveter or a sailmaker. There was something undignified in calling a man a labourer; he was a ship's carpenter, and every man should be called after the grade to which he belonged, and should receive the proper wage for the work he performed. He had always found, although the rates in various parts of the country were high, that men as public men were very reasonable in the matter of granting a fair day s pay for a fair and honest day's work. Therefore he ventured to hope that the position of these men who received 24s. a week would not only be improved as regards their being called according to their grade, but also by having their pay increased to that which was paid for similar work in private yards which built ships of the Government. It was inconsistent on the part of the Government that they should pay these men such a wage while they compelled contractors, under the Fair Wage Resolution, to pay the union rate of wage of the district in which the work was done. He recently accompanied a deputation to the First Lord of the Admiralty and the indications given then were such that he hoped and believed the Government were prepared to deal honourably and generously with this matter, and were such that he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty would be able to tell the House that he readily accepted this Amendment. He would not trouble the House with the statistics of the various trades; it was sufficient for him to say that they were prepared to allow the Government to conduct the business in the dockyards in the way best suited to themselves provided they were prepared to recognise the trades union conditions with regard to the establishments concerned. Again, with regard to mechanics they had in the dockyards engineers, boilermakers, shipwrights, joiners, sailmakers, all the trades combined, yet in connection with those they found the rates of wages far below those paid in private yards all over the country, and here again they asked that the House should consider the very moderate request that the Government should pay the union rates. There was another point. In the dockyards, where the piece-work system was in operation, the system differed very widely from that adopted by private firms. The piece workers in the country had been able, with credit to themselves and the trade, to negotiate with their employers and had secured terms which had been agreed to amicably by both, and the system had operated most successfully. But in the dockyards they found that the schedule of prices had been drafted by the permanent officials of the Admiralty, or some one in the dockyards. The men had no share in the compilation of the schedule, and when the checkers were sent down at the end of the week, and the men were told what was due to them they found, although they had been working very hard under the piecework system, they had not earned a week's wages. He had no desire to suggest that trades unions were required in the Navy, but he ventured to say that this reasonable suggestion should operate in the dockyards, namely, that the men should be permitted to negotiate with the Admiralty for the purpose of scheduling the prices of the work at which they had to earn their living. He wanted to draw the attention of the House to another grievance which arose under the working of the Workmen's Compensation Act. They were told when that Act was passed that there would be no litigation, or at least very little, but some of them found in their own daily work that there had been a great deal of litigation. In many respects the Act was a good one. But he could not understand why a Government which framed the Bill were the first people to contract out of it. What did the Admiralty do? The

Act provided for contracting out, and the Government sent to those workers a carefully prepared scheme which he ventured to say was very bad in every respect. He could give instances where men who had been totally disabled were receiving only a pittance which was unworthy of the Government who gave it. What they wanted was that there should be no contracting out under the Act. There was another grievance from which the workmen suffered. As a workman in the dockyard himself, he felt degraded when on going out of the yard a policeman accosted him, and he had to be searched. There was no private yard in the country which would place a workman in such an indignified position. Then there was the question of overtime. Recently the Admiralty had constructed a vessel in record time. The men were working day and night, though by the order of the Admiralty under the late Government thousands of men were discharged from the royal dockyard. If they wanted overtime let them have relays of men—one set of men working by day and the other by night, or let there be an eight hours day and three shifts. They were told that the dockyard workers received a superannuation allowance. That was granted, but how many men in the dockyard were on the establishment? About 30,000 men were employed in the dockyard, but only 22½ per cent. were on the establishment, so that a great number of the workers were not entitled to receive the superannuation allowance. That should not be considered against them in any way. So far as pensions after retirement were concerned that was only a question of six or seven years, and there were many men who, on the eve of the time when they would receive a pension on retirement, were struck down, and the money which had been stopped from their pay was not handed over to their families or other relatives. He hoped the grievances which he had brought to the attention of the House would be mitigated. He thanked the House for the manner in which they had listened to him, and he begged to move.

*Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) seconded the Amendment, which he considered was a very reasonable one. It merely asked, in the first place, that the Government should do what all private employers were doing at the present time, namely, pay the trade union rate of wages, and, in the second place, that the men should have a right to represent their grievances through their accredited representatives. In making that request they relied on the precedent created by the Postmaster-General, who had conceded the right to the post office employés to negotiate with the Postmaster-General through their accredited representative, and they simply asked that that principle should be extended to the dockyards. With regard to Portsmouth, he held in his hand a petition which had been presented by the dockyard men there, but up to now no redress had been given for the grievances of which they complained. From that petition he found that the sailmakers had to serve an apprenticeship of six or seven years, yet the men working in the yard at the present time were receiving only from 28s. to 29s. 6d. a week, whilst in private yards men doing the same work were receiving from 31s. 6d. to 42s. In London they received 40s. 6d., in Liverpool 36s., and in other places sums ranging from 33s. 9d. to 36s. per week; and in making the request that they should receive 33s. these men were asking for no more than they were entitled to, having regard to the wages paid elsewhere. It would no doubt be argued that they worked shorter hours than men employed in private yards, but even so, if the amount of the hours worked was taken in relation to the wage paid it would be found that they were receiving less than the trade union rate. He hoped the Government would concede these two points.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word, 'That' to the end of the Question in order to add the words 'This House is of opinion that the Government, as model employers, should pay the workers in the dockyards not less than the standard trade union rate of wages paid for similar work in the district; further, in order to maintain amicable relations between the heads of the respective departments and the employees, the right of negotiation through the accredited representatives of the workmen should be at once recognised.'"—(*Mr. Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. NAPIER (Faversham) said that, as representing the dockyard town of Sheerness, he ventured to intervene in this debate and to associate himself with a large number of the sentiments expressed by other dockyard Members and with the arguments which they had placed before the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty would no doubt be ready to acknowledge that Sheerness had certain characteristics which were not common to most of the dockyard towns of the country. Sheerness was more completely a Government town than probably any other town in the country. It was practically without any other industry than the dockyard. Plymouth, Portsmouth and Chatham all had other industries, and when a man was discharged from those dockyards it was possible for him to obtain other employment in the surrounding district, but when a man was discharged from the Sheerness dockyard he had to migrate. This little town was surrounded on two sides by the sea and upon the other two sides by Government lands which the Government refused either to sell or to lease for business purposes, and beyond those lands were others over which the Government had certain rights which they exercised in the direction of forbidding any building. Having regard to these circumstances he submitted that Sheerness had some further claim upon the Government than other dockyard towns. The House would hardly realise that during the last year one third of the hands employed in the Sheerness dockyard had been dismissed, which meant that in this small town there was something like £1,000 per week less to be spent, and the distress during the winter had been exceedingly great. It had been perhaps more private than public in character because the people were thrifty and most of them had saved and owned their own houses, but their savings had now gone and their houses were either sold or mortgaged. There was little sign of the sufferings they had gone through because the dockyard men had formed a Distress Committee and had helped their less fortunate fellows, but the town was now at its worst and they wanted to know what the Government were going to do with them next year. Two years ago a deputation waited on Lord Selborne, and the noble Lord told that deputation that there was no reason to believe that there would be in future years many discharges, because they were going to make the town a first class repairing depot for torpedo destroyers.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member appeared to be dealing with matters outside the scope of the Motion.

MR. NAPIER said in that case he would reserve his remarks until some other opportunity.

SIR J. BAKER (Portsmouth) said he wished to impress on the Admiralty that the rate of wages paid in Portsmouth dockyard was far behind the average rate paid by other employers, and was below the rate absolutely necessary to enable a man to live decently. The wages paid to labourers and mechanics was from

19s. to 22s. a week, or 2s. or 3s. below the current rate in the locality. It was to the discredit of the Admiralty that they should persist in such a course. The same remark applied to every department in the dockyard, and the plea that there was continuity of employment with the prospect of a pension had been shown over and over again to have no foundation whatever. Just as winter was approaching, 1,500 men were discharged in batches week by week. Was that continuity of employment or a model for other employers? When the Admiralty wanted men they sent to the north to the great trades unions. Was it fair to employees that the Admiralty should deal with masses of men in such a summary manner? As to the possibility of a discharged man obtaining employment, once discharged he had to tramp the country and sometimes wander 300 or 400 miles before he could obtain similar employment. In the last five years there had been no improvement whatever, and the Admiralty had made no attempt to meet the demands of the men. Dockyard Members had pressed their arguments without effect. Except for a few small concessions there had been practically nothing during the past five years commensurate with the scale which the Admiralty admitted they should maintain as model employers paying the rate of wages current in the locality. The men had been waiting expectantly, and as they had a new Government with a new policy they hoped that the new policy would be in accordance with the general sentiment of the country.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he had no fault to find with what was said by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. He had no hesitation in saying that both propositions in the Amendment were reasonable. He would take the second part of the Amendment first, namely, that which required the Government to recognise the right of negotiation through the accredited representatives of the workmen. The desire was a perfectly fair and reasonable one, and was not likely to meet with opposition. The Government also recognised, in principle, that it was their duty to pay "the trade union rate of wages paid for similar work in the district," but they coupled that with the condition that differences between dockyard and outside work must be taken into account. His noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty met the other day a deputation of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, and he believed the hon. Member for Chatham was present and was not dissatisfied with what was said by his noble friend. At that interview the First Lord made reference to certain dockyard conditions which might modify to some extent the wages paid in the dockyards as compared with the trade union wages outside. He accepted both parts of the Amendment in spirit and substance, subject to the condition stated by Lord Tweedmouth, to which no exception was taken. The hon. Member for Chatham had alluded to two points which could not perhaps be quite covered by the Amendment. One point was with regard to the Workmens' Compensation Act, which it would require legislation to alter. On the question of overtime, perhaps he might be permitted to say that his noble friend and he, and their colleagues, were in full sympathy with the general dislike expressed with regard to it. He ventured to hope that what he had said would meet with substantial approval from the mover and seconder of the Amendment, and that they would be satisfied with the discussion. He would add that when he was last at the Admiralty it was the practice for the members of the Board to go down to the dockyards and to hear from the employees their story. He had sat through many of those deputations. They intended to carry on that practice. The Board would visit the yards in turn and discuss in a friendly manner with the workmen or their representatives questions in which they were interested. It was intended, if possible, to make a beginning in the Easter Vacation. Although he accepted practically every word in the Amendment, almost unconditionally, it was impossible, of course, for the Government to accept the Amendment as that would be to defeat the main question, which was that the Speaker do leave the Chair, and before carrying that Motion, they could not, of course, proceed to put their benevolent intention into practice.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he approved of the sympathetic spirit in which the Amendment had been met by the Government. It was satisfactory to know that there was a reasonable probability of an end being put to the scandal of men working for the Government for starvation wages. As he understood the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman it was that, not at once, but as soon as possible, the wages paid in the dockyards would be levelled up to the wages paid for the same work in private yards. He understood, also, that in future not only would the Admiralty receive complaints from a trade union, but that when a Committee of the Admiralty visited a dockyard they would receive complaints from the men, and that the men might be accompanied by the trade union officials to assist them in putting their case. He was glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman assented to that. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman's statement would be received with very great satisfaction by all Government workers. With regard to the Workmens' Compensation Act he thought the right hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension. His hon. friend did not argue for an amended Compensation Act, but pointed out that the Government workers were contracted out of the existing Act to their disadvantage. If an improved Workmens' Compensation Act was to become law shortly there might be no reason for interfering with the existing arrangement; but under the new Act it was hoped and expected that the Government would not set the bad example of contracting its own *employes* out of its operation. He was sure his hon. friend would be consulting his own wishes and those of the Labour Members if he allowed his Amendment to be negatived.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked if he might take the opportunity to put a Question and at the same time to congratulate the Civil Lord of the Admiralty on filling an office which he hoped he would find as interesting as he found it. He desired to ask whether the new hospital at Cape Town would be ready for the accommodation of patients during the present year. Anyone who had access to the reports about the old hospital would be anxious that the new hospital should be ready at the earliest possible time. If, as he had been informed, the work still remaining undone was not in the hospital itself, but in the medical officers' quarters, could not some temporary arrangement be made for the accommodation of the medical officers, so that the patients might have the advantage of the new building at the earliest possible moment? He also desired to know whether the Admiralty had arranged that properly qualified nursing sisters should be appointed to every considerable naval hospital, both at home and abroad; and whether any progress was being made under the scheme adopted some time ago whereby naval medical officers were to be given opportunities of walking the hospitals at home in order that they might keep themselves abreast with the progress in medical science.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton) thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the kind references he had made to him. The right hon. Gentleman knew well that the old hospital at Cape Town was not one which commended itself to the Admiralty or the medical authorities. Through the change of policy in regard to the redistribution of the Fleet the proposed accommodation in the new hospital had been considerably reduced. The Admiralty hoped the hospital would be completed in the next financial year. The quarters for the senior medical officers would also be completed in that year. With regard to nursing sisters he was glad to say that in all the considerable hospitals they were employed. In only three cases—Ascension, Cape of Good Hope, and Yokohama—they were not employed, because these hospitals were so small that it was hardly worth while to send nurses there. As to medical officers being allowed to walk the hospitals here, he was sorry he could not give the right hon. Gentleman a definite reply. He could assure him that the matter would receive the most favourable consideration of the Government.

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES 1906-7.

1. 129,000 Officers, Seamen, and Boys.

2. £6,810,700, Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,954,500, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Expense of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants in Aid, and other Charges connected therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1907."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN hoped the right hon. Gentleman would agree at this stage to report Progress. He thought the right hon. Gentleman must be well satisfied with the Votes already agreed to. In his experience he had never before known the two Votes just agreed to to pass without discussion as had now been allowed to do.

He welcomed the unanimity with which the Committee had approved the Estimates prepared by the late Government, and he wished he could believe that, had they still been responsible for their conduct, they would have been accepted with the same unanimity. The Estimates were only placed in their hands that morning, and, as Members had had only the smallest possible time in which to make themselves acquainted with them, he moved to report Progress, so that further opportunity might be given for their consideration.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was far from saying that there was anything unreasonable in the request of the right hon. Gentleman. He was deeply grateful to the Committee for passing these Votes. Of course, it must be understood that these were Estimates agreed to on both sides of the House. That remark applied equally to the Vote now before them, and as they had still thirty-five minutes before the hour for adjournment he thought it might be advantageous to hear what objections there might be to any of the items in this very important Vote. If there were no real exception taken to it, they might be allowed to add this Vote to the Votes already agreed to.

*Mr. LEE reminded the right hon. Gentleman that this Vote, which was certainly not expected to come on for discussion that day, afforded the only opportunity they would have this session of discussing the loan expenditure of £3,000,000. If the Vote were allowed to pass without due notice the whole of the works for which the loan was required would go through without any discussion at all. He did not think that was desirable. A large number of hon. Members were anxious to have an opportunity of discussing the great works comprised in this Vote, and it would be only reasonable on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to agree to postpone the consideration of the Vote.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was sorry to appear unreasonable, but he thought they might utilise the half hour which remained to them in hearing what objections, if any, could be urged against this very important Vote.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that naturally, they did not wish to criticise Estimates in so far as they accorded with the Estimates which they themselves prepared, but he thought that private Members ought to have some opportunity of considering them. The discussion should not be confined to Members sitting on the Front Benches. Although he and his hon. friend had had an opportunity of seeing the Estimates, that was not true of private Members. It was not unreasonable that they should ask for a little more time to be allowed for examining the Votes before they were passed. He was sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would recognise the reasonableness of the request he had made. The Speaker had been moved out of the Chair at a reasonable time, two Votes had been passed, and the right hon. Gentleman was now asking the House to proceed with Vote 10 until half-past 7 o'clock. The point which he wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider was that no Member of the House except those in office or who had been lately in office, had had any opportunity of seeing the Estimates until that morning, and it was not reasonable to ask private Members to proceed with discussion until they had had an opportunity of examining the Votes. Moreover, Vote 10 was the only Vote on which they would have an opportunity this year of discussing the works policy and the loan expenditure which the Financial Secretary admitted would amount to three and a quarter millions. He repeated the appeal which he had already made.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.) said that if it were shown to him that there was any general disposition amongst private Members the Government would not oppose at half-past seven the Motion to report progress.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that he was quite satisfied with the offer made by the Chanceller of the Exchequer, and he begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question proposed.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said that it had been promised early in the afternoon that the Civil Lord of the Admiralty would give the Committee some information in regard to two items in the Vote which showed a variation between the Estimates as they were originally drawn and those now before the House. The first had reference to Rosyth and the other to large alterations at Portsmouth. In the original draft of the Estimates there was a Vote of two and a half millions for the new Naval base at Rosyth, and a certain sum was put down for starting the work this year. It was also the intention to let the main contract about June. They were now informed that that intention had been given up, although it was not the intention of the Admiralty to abandon the whole project. He wanted some further explanation of the necessity of the change and of the intentions of the Government in regard to Rosyth. His second point had regard to the big alterations at Portsmouth upon which £940,000 were to be spent, the item appearing in the Estimate for the first time. He was personally generally acquainted with the idea of the scheme, but it might possibly have been modified since the late Government initiated it. He thought there could therefore be no valid objection to the right hon. Gentleman giving them the details in regard to this work. He would reserve any points of criticism upon these matters until he had heard the right hon. Gentleman's explanation.

*MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) desired to know, in reference to these extensive alterations and additions to the docks accommodation, whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to advertise and to state that the contractors tendering for the work would be required to pay the trade union rate of wages in the district where the work was to be done

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the Government wished to give hon. Members an opportunity of giving notice of any question that they desired to be discussed. As no other hon. Member had risen, he did not see that they could usefully go on. Therefore, in order to carry out the undertaking that had been given, he begged to move that progress be reported.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question put and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON moved in clause 1, page 1, line 6, to leave out "Parliament otherwise determine," and insert "thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and twelve."

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 6, to leave out 'Parliament otherwise determine' and insert 'thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and twelve.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," and negatived.

Question put, "That these words be there inserted," and agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended to be considered to-morrow.

Mr. Edmund Robertson.

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed —And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it:—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of,—Mr. E. Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Colonel Legge, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. J. W. Philipps, Mr. Charles Shaw, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. Wills, and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum. —(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn." (*Mr. Joseph Albert Pease.*)

Put and agreed to.

Adjourned at Twenty-three Minutes after Seven o'Clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 2nd March, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

KING'S SPEECH (ANSWER TO ADDRESS).

The Comptroller of the House reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address, as followeth—

"I have received with great satisfaction the loyal and dutiful expression of your thanks for the Speech with which I have opened the present Session of Parliament."

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDERS 62 AND 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Orders Nos. 62 and 63 have been complied with, viz.:—Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PETITIONS.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Aberystwyth and Batley, to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

Copy presented, of Estimates for Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March, 1907, together with a Copy of the Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury relating thereto [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 71.]

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (BRITISH EMPIRE).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the British Empire in each year from 1890–1904. Second Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS, ETC., BILLS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 72.]

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland with respect to the Term of Office of a Visiting Committee, and the holding of the first meeting of a Visiting Committee [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BANKRUPTCY COURTS (IRELAND).

Annual Returns presented, of the Official Assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland and the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Education—Rule 127 (b).

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of school managers who recommended the introduction of the Rule 127 (b), and the number of managers who have approved of it since its introduction; and whether the rule has been approved by any Catholic clerical manager in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) This Question could not be answered without an exhaustive examination of the correspondence of the Commissioners for the past three years. This would take a very long time and would not be conclusive. As regards the attitude of Catholic opinion in Ireland towards Rule 127 (b), I may remind the hon. Member that for many years the right of infant boys to be educated in convent national schools has been embodied in the Commissioners' rules, and there has never been any objection to this rule by the Catholic clerical managers. There are about 2,700 national schools under Catholic clerical managers in which boys and girls are educated together.

Post Office Facilities at Dockhead, Rotherhithe.

MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): To ask the Postmaster General whether he can state the reason for the closing of Dockhead post office, Rotherhithe, for delivery of telegrams; and whether in view of the amount of telegraphic work previously carried on in that office, and the inconvenience now caused to business in the neighbourhood, he will consider the advisability of supplying the need of this locality in such a direction.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The delivery of telegrams from the Dockhead post office was discontinued because it was found that, taking the locality as a whole, a better service could be afforded by concentrating the messenger force at other delivery offices in the neighbourhood. I regret that some persons may have suffered inconvenience from the change, but as the locality as a whole has benefited I fear I cannot see my way to revert to the old arrangement. There is also a general advantage in the reduction of the number of delivery offices in London and other large cities. It reduces the number of references to delivery lists, and in that way lessens both the time occupied in transmission and the risk of mis-sending to a wrong office.

Poor Law Medical Officers.

MR. POLLARD (Lancashire, Eccles): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will grant a Return showing for each Poor Law Union the area, population, and number of medical officers and their salaries; and whether extra fees are paid, as required by the Poor Law Orders, and the annual amount of such extra fees.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the Poor Law Commission are considering what statistics they will find it necessary to obtain for the purposes of their inquiry. I will communicate with them with a view of ascertaining whether they propose to get information on the subject referred to in the Question; and, if so, whether it could be made available for the hon. Member.

Compulsory Hiring Orders Issued by County Councils.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state or give in a Return the number of compulsory hiring orders for land issued by county councils and the number confirmed up to date by the Local Government Board under The Local Government Act, 1894, and the number of applications made by urban authorities for parish council powers, and the number of cases in which these have been granted by the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The number of compulsory hiring orders issued by county councils under Section 10 of The Local Government Act, 1894, and submitted to the Local Government Board for confirmation, is thirty-nine. Of these thirty-three have been confirmed by the Board. The precise number of applications made by urban authorities to have conferred upon them the powers of a parish council under the section referred to could not be ascertained without considerable labour. The powers have been given in forty-eight cases.

Opinions on Indian Army Administration.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is prepared to lay upon the Table the opinions of Lord Cromer, Lord Elgin, Sir H. Brackenbury, Sir E. Collen, and Sir D. Barbour, obtained last year by the Committee appointed to report upon changes in the position of the Military Member of the Viceroy's Council in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The opinions of Lord Cromer, Lord Elgin, Sir H. Brackenbury, and Sir E. Collen were obtained privately by my predecessor for his own information and not by the Committee. There is no record of them in the India Office. Sir D. Barbour appeared before the Committee, but no record has been kept of his opinion.

Report of Irish Poor Law Commission.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when it is expected that the Report of the Viceregal Commission appointed by the Government in reference to the Irish Poor Laws will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the Commissioners that they hope to present the Report about the end of next month.

Examination Papers of Irish Petty Sessions Clerks.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will circulate as a Parliamentary Paper the examination papers set to newly-elected clerks of petty sessions in Ireland within the past four years.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) It would not be possible to comply with the hon. Member's request, as the examination papers referred to are not permanently kept on record. The examination is held under the direction of the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks, with the object of satisfying the Lord-Lieutenant, before approving of the appointment, that the person selected by the magistrates is perfectly qualified. During the past four year ninety-nine newly-elected petty sessions clerks have been separately examined, and the examinations have in every case varied.

Transfers of Irish District Police Inspector.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the rule that limits the duration of service of a district inspector of the Royal Irish Constabulary in a particular district to five years is to be observed in the case of Mr. Thomas Lowndes, of Ballinarobe.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension There is no rule to the effect mentioned. I am informed that Mr. Lowndes is one of many district inspectors who have served for upwards of five years in their present districts, and whom the inspector general has no intention of removing at present. District inspectors are transferred according to the exigencies of the service.

Suggested Grant to John Norris of Crossrea, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that John Norris, of Crossrea, county Longford, and his wife are both destitute by reason of the loss of their son John, a private in the South Wales Borderers, who was killed in the South African War; and whether there is any fund from which a small annuity or other grant could be made to these people.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) This case was raised by the hon. Member two years ago, and, while it was not possible for any monetary assistance to be granted either from Army funds or by the Royal Patriotic Fund Commissioners, a small fund was provided by the South African War Fund, then called the Commander-in-Chief's Fund. This fund now only admits of very small grants in special cases; but if an application is made to the War Office by the parents for assistance from this fund it will receive careful consideration.

MEALS FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton) said he did not think anyone in the House would doubt that a very large number of children went to school without food, or underfed, and the object of the Bill was to provide that meals should be given to such children. Of course, differences of opinion might arise in the House as to who should be responsible for the feeding of the children. Some hon. Members might say that it was the duty of parents to see that their children were fed, but when they considered the amount of wages that some parents earned they must be satisfied that it was an absolute impossibility for them to properly feed and clothe their families. There were hundreds of thousands of families in this country whose weekly income did not exceed 18s., and he thought the House would agree that if the children in these families averaged more than three, it was almost impossible for them to be fed as they ought to be. Taking 18s. as the average rate of wages of a very large number of unskilled workers in this country—and he was sorry to say that during the last three years many skilled workers had not earned more than 18s. a week—and taking the average family as consisting of three children, taking the rent at 4s. 6d. a week, and allowing three meals per head per day at 1½ per head per meal, it would be seen that the whole of the wages were gone, and nothing was left for clothing, fire, and the hundred and one things required in a household. Therefore, children whose parents were in that position should at least be fed. It was not the fault of the children that they were there, and if the parents through force of circumstances were unable to feed them properly the State should see that they were fed. The State recognised that it was to its best interests that the children should be educated, and it was only right that the children should be in a fit condition to receive instruction. Better results would then accrue from education. The education authority was the proper authority to deal with the question. He went further and said that even in cases where the parents of children were earning sufficient to provide them with food, that if the education authority thought it would be to the best interests of the State that those children should be fed they should have the power to feed them, and to make a charge upon the parents afterwards. In many of the industrial centres both fathers and mothers were working during the day, and if the children had the opportunity of having meals supplied by the authority they would be quite willing to pay for such meals. Even if the parents were unable to pay they should not be pauperised by accepting such assistance. He asked the House to look at the matter from a strictly business standpoint. Everyone must have noticed the very large number of what he might term human weeds among the children who attended the schools of the State. The present system which permitted children to attend school in an underfed condition was the means of, he was almost going to say, manufacturing undesirables; but undoubtedly it was to a great extent responsible for physical deterioration. If that deterioration could be arrested by providing children with food they would have done something which would be beneficial to the nation in the future. No one would deny, that if a child went to school with a full stomach it was in a better condition to receive instruction, and would be more fitted to take its place in life. The fact that children attended school underfed was also responsible for mental deterioration. He was convinced that the presence of a large number of inmates of lunatic asylums and epileptic homes could be traced to the fact that in their early days they were underfed. No one would deny, too, that underfeeding had a tendency to create disease. He was sure that their being underfed was a direct incentive to crime on the part of children. In the opinion of some who were opposed to the State feeding of children reliance ought to be placed upon charity. They had relied upon charity too long as it was. He knew of many instances in which children of working people had gone to school fed by the charity of people very often not much better off than the parents of the children that were fed. Looking at this question from the standpoint of low wages the House would agree that something should be done. It was quite impossible for the hundreds of thousands of fathers out of work at the present time to provide for their children as they ought, and the State ought to see that these future citizens were fed. It had been said that the children of a nation were its best assets. That being so, let those assets be made as valuable as possible. Charity was not a reliable source from which to provide meals for children, and therefore he asked the Government to accept the Bill to provide underfed school children with at least one good meal a day. If this was done he felt sure the nation would appreciate it. From a business point of view the money would be well invested, because not only would the children be better equipped for fighting the battle of life, but it would be found in the near future that the expenditure on prisons, workhouses, and asylums was considerably reduced, and therefore the money invested would be returned with interest. He moved the Second Reading of the Bill, because he believed it would be to the best interests and the welfare of the nation, and he asked the House in the name of humanity and Christianity to adopt the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. W. T. Wilson.*)

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said he rose for the purpose of explaining in a few words why he gave a cordial welcome to the early appearance of this Bill. There were in his constituency a great many Socialists who, in the exercise of their honest convictions, had voted against him, and if he was spared they would do so again. He had had no quarrel with them, and had no quarrel with them now, and if he could do anything, however slight, without sacrifice of his own opinions, to advance any objects which were dear to them, and for which they had toiled, it would give him sincere pleasure and satisfaction. One of the Socialist candidates for Northampton, Mr. Williams, who, he believed, was well known to the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and the gentlemen who acted with him, as soon as he knew of his return, asked him with great courtesy to take up this question, which he said was the most urgent of all social reforms. Without committing himself to that estimate of the question it give him sincere pleasure to comply with his request. He supported this Bill for three reasons. The first was expressed in the eloquent words of Mr. Disraeli—

> "The youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity."

The second reason was that, as they compelled parents to send their children to school, to teach a starving child was torture. He remembered a pious, orthodox clergyman, Dean Burgon, who had been accused of giving too much money to the poor—not an accusation, however, that he thought a Christian man at the close of his life would look back upon with much regret and shame—said to him—

> "How can I talk to a poor woman about her soul when she has got no sole to her boots?"

And it was impossible to fill the mind of a child, or what was far more important, to train the reasoning faculties of a child, when that child was suffering from the pangs of hunger. His third and last reason was that when Parliament had imposed on the local authority an arduous, responsible, and important duty, it should also clothe that authority with the fullest possible discretion as to the manner in which that duty should be carried out. For these reasons, and believing that free meals, if judiciously and cautiously given, would be no more demoralising than free education, he gave his cordial support to the Second Reading of this Bill.

*MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said that in supporting his hon. friend who moved the adoption of the Bill he would like to point out to the House that the question with which the Bill proposed to deal was not a new one so far as Parliament was concerned. In the last Parliament this subject engaged the attention of the House on several occasions, and as recently as the 18th April last a Resolution was passed by a considerable majority, which was almost in identical terms with the main clause of the Bill now before the House. The Resolution he referred to was as follows—

> "That in the opinion of this House local education authorities should be empowered, as unanimously recommended by the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, 1904, to make provision under such regulations and conditions as they may decide for ensuring that all the children of any public elementary school in their area shall receive proper nourishment before being subjected to mental or physical instruction, and for recovering the cost where expedient from the parents or guardians."

That Motion, he rejoiced to know, was supported from all sections of the House. He hoped this would influence the course the Government would adopt. The late Government last session took a most important step so far as this question was concerned. After that Motion had been passed orders were issued by the Board of Education and the Local Government Board suggesting a way in which this great evil might be dealt with throughout the country. Those with whom he had the honour of acting and himself did not altogether approve of the policy outlined in the orders to which he had referred. But this, at any rate, was gained: that the late Government recognised that there was an evil and a public responsibility for finding a remedy for that evil. Therefore they made a considerable step in advance, so far as this question was concerned. There could be no doubt that this subject had been forced into the region of Party† politics, because of the statements contained in the Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland and the Report of the Commission on Physical Deterioration. The former of these two Reports said—

> "We consider that the question of the proper and sufficient feeding of children is one which has the closest public connection with any scheme which may be adopted for their physical equally with their mental work. It is evident among the causes which affect the physical welfare of the population that the lack of proper nourishment is amongst the most serious."

The Report went on to say—

> "A large number of important witnesses, members of the medical profession, inspectors of schools, teachers and others, were unanimously of opinion that it was most desirable that increased attention should be paid to the feeding of the children attending State-aided schools."

If they turned to the Report of the Physical Deterioration Committee they would find an abundance of similarly conclusive statements. On page 66 he found the following statement—

> "It was nevertheless acknowledged that the evils arising from under-feeding were so widespread, and in certain localities so pressing, that some authoritative intervention was called for at the earliest possible moment to secure that the education of the children who are obliged by law to attend school shall not be hampered and retarded by the physical condition thereby engendered."

One of the most important expert witnesses that appeared before that Commission, Dr. Eichholz, stated that in his opinion 122,000 of the elementary school population of London, or about 16 per cent., were underfed, and referring to the Johanna Street board school in Lambeth he declared that 90 per cent. of the children there were unable, by reason of their physical condition, to attend to their work. Dr. Mackenzie, the Medical Officer to the Local Government Board for Scotland, said—

> "In the slums of Edinburgh a large proportion of the children were half-starved, and he agreed that to subject the half-starved child to the routine of a school would be the height of cruelty, and that the educational result would be poor."

That was an authoritative statement of an officer of the Local Government Board for Scotland. Many hon. Members might have read, during the last few days, a speech delivered by a gentleman who only recently was a most respected Member of this House—he referred to Mr. Samuel Smith. He had had a very extensive experience—he thought all who knew him would admit—of social work in the great city of Liverpool. In that speech he made the following statement—

> "We now have got the whole children of the nation to school until they are about fourteen years of age, and five or six millions of them were in our primary schools. We could shape their lives very much by the training we gave them. For the most part that training was excellent and the schools were a most civilising, in fact, he might say a Christianising agency. But we had cared too little for the health and physical well-being of the children. It would not be doubted that at least 5 to 10 per cent. of our town children were badly fed, and very much underfed, and also poorly clothed, and wretchedly housed."

That statement appeared to him to prove in the most conclusive manner that we had, so far as the child life of this country was concerned, a great and serious evil in our midst. He was bound to admit that with regard to the remedy for this evil there was room for some difference of opinion. What he would ask was, Were the means suggested in the Bill introduced by his hon. friend practical? The promoters of this Bill suggested that power should be given to the educational authorities, wherever they found a number of children in their schools insufficiently or badly fed, to take the matter at once in hand and arrange to give them certain meals daily. It was also suggested that power should be given to the education authority in certain cases to recover the cost of the meals from the parents or guardians. The promoters laid it clearly down that it ought to be proved that the parents were in a position to fulfil their obligation to the children, and absolutely failed to do so. The manner and means of the relief were left absolutely to the discretion of the local education authorities. The promoters of the Bill suggested this course first of all as being in their judgment the most practical, and, secondly, because it was most in harmony with the recommendations of the two Reports to which he had already referred. He would like to emphasise that whilst they left it to the discretion of the education authorities as to the manner and means, they were desirous that they should be placed under some obligation to act at once; that immediately they found out that the evil existed in their area they should be compelled, and it should not be a matter of discretion, to take some action—whatever action their own judgment might lead them to decide upon. But the question might very properly be raised as to the cost involved either to the State or to the local education authorities by this new undertaking. He thought that all Members, especially those who had been associated with municipal life, would be ready to recognise that the rates were already more than many of the local authorities could bear. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear!"] He thought that that sentiment would have a warm reception in one part of the House at least. Yes, but they did not ask that more money should be spent; that was not their object; what they did say was that the money already devoted to education should be spent more effectively than it had been up to the present time. Personally, he hoped that the day was not far distant when the whole charge for a great national system of education would be in itself a national charge, but in the meantime, in dealing with this question, he again wished to repeat that their desire was that the money spent on education should be efficiently spent, and not be, as he was afraid it was to-day in some centres, to a great extent wasted. Certain objections would doubtless be urged to the policy laid down in the Bill. He knew that they would be told, as they had been told in previous discussions, that to adopt the course suggested would be interfering with parental responsibility, and that they would also be placing a premium on thriftlessness. He did not believe in either of those objections. He would be the last to suggest that they should in any way interfere, in the sense that had been suggested, with parental responsibility. What he was anxious to do was to bring home, as it had never been brought home before, that this object could not be attained by charitable means. Experience had proved that charity instead of bringing home parental responsibility was one of the most serious and insidious influences in sapping and destroying parental responsibility. Therefore, they were anxious, as his hon. friend in moving the Second Reading of the Bill had pointed out, to go the length of suggesting that if parents were in a position to provide for their children and they failed to do so, the law should step in and deal with the parents, even to the extent of recovering the cost, and in bad cases they would go so far as not only to scarify them, but further punish the parent for neglecting his obligations to his child. The class that they were asking the House to provide for might very naturally be divided into three sections. In the first place there were the destitute children, whose parents were in extreme poverty for reasons that were preventable. Secondly, there were those whose parents were in temporary poverty because of enforced idleness. And thirdly, and he thought they were the most important of all, there were those whose fathers' economic condition when they were in work was of such a nature as almost to exclude any possibility of making that provision for their children which they might so much desire. He would urge upon the House that whatever was the condition of the parent in this matter, their immediate and foremost concern, as the guardians of this great nation, ought to be not with the father, but with the child. As his hon. friend had said, the children of this nation were one of its most valuable assets, so valuable that this House at any rate should be the guardians of the nation's interests, and see that one of its most valuable assets was not destroyed. It was most important that the House should notice that the Bill made provision for dealing with the whole of the classes to which he had referred. Where the parent failed to meet the necessities of the child if he was able to do so the Bill would step in and recover the cost.

---

† See Column 1400.

Where help was given it was to be given because help was needed and deserved. The last point in the Bill was that its promoters considered, he thought rightly so, that they should run no risk, by getting this principle put into operation, of disfranchising the deserving poor. He thought the House in recent years had been gradually led to recognise that the ease with which honest, upright and deserving working men were robbed of their rights of citizenship ought for ever to end. In introducing to the House any new legislation if they were going to err at all they ought to err on the side of protecting the well-deserving, even if by so doing they included a small percentage of the thriftless, and, he might almost say, the worthless in the retention of citizenship. This was a very simple Bill. The principle had been admitted in past sessions of Parliament by all sections of the House. He would therefore appeal to the Government to accept the principle of the measure. There might be room for differences of opinion on points of detail, but these were matters for consideration in Committee. He believed he was right in saying that the Government had decided to leave this an open question with their followers. He suggested that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee of the House where matters of detail could be discussed. He hoped the Bill would soon become law, and that this first session of a new Parliament would have done something to alleviate the suffering of the children, and to assist in bringing up a better manhood and womanhood in the country.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said this was a question which had occupied the whole of his life, in which he was deeply interested, and on which he had formed the deepest convictions. He therefore felt compelled to ask the indulgence of the House, and hon. Members below the gangway would perhaps not consider it presumption on his part to say that he fully sympathised with their objects, that he felt the seriousness of the difficulties surrounding the question, and that he longed as earnestly as they did to find a remedy. He trusted that those hon. Members would give him credit for feeling deeply the need of a remedy, and for seeking a remedy with an earnestness equal to their own. He protested against the idea that the interest in these children, and the insistence upon doing something for them, and for sweeping away what was a stain on our civilisation was the prerogative and the monopoly of any one Party in the country. He had only to look to the remarks of the hon. Member for Northampton who found a motto for his speech in the words of the great Leader of the Conservative Party. The hon. Member for the Barnard Castle Division had said that this question had been forced into the arena of Party politics. What evidence did he adduce for that statement?

*MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I am reminded that I made a slip. I did not intend to say " Party politics." I should have said practical politics.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that the hon. Member had referred to the Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training. That Commission was formed by a Conservative Government, and many Members on both sides of the House sat upon it. Their Report was unanimously signed. He represented a constituency which in regard to the number of electors compared favourably with the constituencies even in the great centres of population, though, as regarded wealth, it was, perhaps, one of the poorest of all the constituencies, and probably one half of it knew from personal experience the difficulties of the poor, and the struggles against grinding poverty. They knew also the stifling effects which those conditions had upon the efforts of the people who were working in the cause of education. The hon. Member for the Barnard Castle Division thought that the great money cost of carrying out the proposals of this Bill might be a difficulty for them, but, looking to the magnitude of the evil, great as the money burden might be, it was the duty of the nation, cost what it would, to remove this stain. He himself estimated that it might cost, if the full provisions possible under this Bill were adopted, between £12,000,000 and £15,000,000 a year to carry out the work. [Cries of " No."] He thought they would find on a careful calculation that it could hardly be done at a less cost than 1s. a week or about 40s. a year per child, allowing for School holidays. That might make it difficult for the Government to carry out all their promises of retrenchment, but he trusted at least that it would not stand in their way. He objected to the principles of the Bill itself. They were principles which those who had spoken had too easily passed over. He would endeavour to show what he objected to in those principles and how they constituted the very kernel of the question. In the first place, the Bill was called an Education Bill. Hon. Members who were promoting the measure would forgive him for saying that this was a misnomer of the worst kind, and that it proceeded on a fallacy in regard to the more scientific theories of education. What was education? If, it was said, the children were to be compelled to take advantage of the education provided they must be nourished to be able to take it. Did hon. Members think that the idea we had of education at the present day was that it was a certain amount of scholastic instruction, a certain amount of facts, statistics, or information, which was to be pressed into the brain of a child? Surely we had come to some different idea of education from that. If the school did its duty it was to train the child with tender care and not to press information into the mind of a boy, but to train carefully and tenderly the nascent faculties. The duty of the school and the schoolmaster was not to see how much fact and information they could press into a certain number of boys, but to see how tenderly, carefully, and cautiously the children could be trained without over-pressure and over-straining. The Bill was assumed to be for the benefit of the children. He presumed that those who spoke in favour of it would not deny that description. But was it true that it was really for the benefit of the children? He ventured to say that it touched only the merest fringe of the question. Were they only to look after what they thought the healthy and growing generation? Were they only to look after the children who were within the walls of the schools? Were they to begin only at five years of age and end at fourteen? Was there no further duty resting upon them? Was it in the healthy surroundings of the school, under good care, under proper attendance, comfortably warmed and housed, that the children suffered chiefly from want of nourishment? Had they not now recognised that the duty of the State to those of the young generation was from the time they came into the world, and that it was a work which could not be bounded by the walls of a school? Would not any medical authority tell them that the greatest injury to the health of the young generation occurred long before they entered the doors of a school? Was it not the case that those who did not come within the schools suffered even more? Was not the strain far greater on the street arab wandering about in unwholesome surroundings? Did not he suffer much more than those children who came within the school doors and who were more or less attended to? What of housing, what of clothing, what of ignorance of the very primary principles of sanitation? He regretted the great difficulties of this case, but the proposals in this Bill bore only on a small part of the great evils they had to deal with and further, they were the part which could be most successfully dealt with by voluntary effort. Statistics proved that they had been largely so dealt with. There was a different way of dealing with what might be called the residuum of the population—the children who were drawn from the bad stock and criminal strata of society and were educated in reformatories. He knew how well they were looked after and how admirable was their condition, and how comparatively hard was the lot of the poor but independent parent earnestly and eagerly struggling to rear his child! He had studied the inner life of reformatories. He knew how much admirable work was done and how miraculous was the benefit they did, and how surprising the transformation which they effected on the very worst material in the course of a few years. But, was there not in these reformatories the absence of one sacred principle? As one moved among the benches, one felt that there was something wanting in the eyes of the pupils, how much they missed who did not know the tenderness and the care of a mother. One or two incidents that had happened in the course of his experience of these reformatories he might relate. The saddest thing that ever was said to him was by one who had done hard and successful work in one of these reformatories. That gentleman, after showing him the admirable and successful work he had done, as he was leaving said that the one thing above others he desired for all the inmates of the reformatory was that before their time had expired their parents would be dead; for, if not, his work would be undone! He remembered having a long conversation with the head of one of the great reformatories in Glasgow. She was a lady who had done most admirable work as the head of that institution. She told him that precisely the same difficulties had arisen in her case; and she gave him an instance of one girl who was compelled by her parents to refuse a situation and to remain at home. This lady heard afterwards that the kit which had been supplied to the girl when she left the reformatory had been pawned by her parents, and that nothing but the worst possible prospect was thereafter open to her. The lady forcibly entered the house of the parents, rescued the girl and shipped her off to Canada. Her action was not strictly legal, but he was sure the House would sympathise and agree with him that she was right. This Bill took away the distinction between the parents who did their duty and the parents who did not. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of the Bill had slurred over what was the vital principle of it; viz., that the local education authority was to be at liberty not only to feed the children who wanted food from the inability of their parents to provide it, but any other children in the school. That was the evil, and that was the principle of the Bill to which he objected. It was not because of its cost, not because he did not sympathise with the sufferings of these children; but because, in the interests of the children themselves, he felt that the doing away with that distinction was nothing else than a calamity. If they did not defend society against thriftless, selfish, reckless parents, if they did not defend such parents against themselves, at least, let Parliament defend the children against such parents. This distinction was not to be slurred over by simply saying that it might or might not be done by the local authority. They had heard much of devolution of authority by the Imperial Parliament, but there were certain principles which the Imperial Parliament was not permitted to delegate; and one of these was what should be the bed-rock of our social economy. That was not to be left to be decided in various ways by different local authorities. It must be a matter settled, and settled once for all, by the Imperial Parliament, as the great Senate of the nation. Hon. Members below the gangway who supported what he thought was a dangerous principle might entertain different views from himself. They might think that the redistribution of wealth was necessary; that social inequalities had to be redressed; and perhaps they were prepared to pass what they deemed just measures for that end. He could not agree to that, believing, as he did, that the great economic laws would work their inexorable will and would undo what they attempted to do, by forces too strong for them. But let them bring forward those measures for discussion on a fair, open, and unambiguous footing. Let them not find the arena for such a struggle in the path of the school manager and the school teacher. That path was a dull, dreary and prosaic one. It was one which required infinite patience, infinite care, and endless experiment, and on which, at the best, progress was slow. He beseeched them not to throw a glare on that quiet, obscure and unobtrusive path by lighting it up with the fantastic fireworks of socialism.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said he apprehended that every Member who took part in the discussion would follow the hon. Member who had just sat down in expressing sympathy with the hon. Member for the Westhoughton division in the objects he had in view in introducing this Bill. He hoped the majority of the House would be able to go much further in finding some practical solution to the difficulties surrounding this question, which were numerous, than the hon. Member for Glasgow University had done. As a medical man, and as Chairman of the Education Committee of the London County Council, he ventured to say that the proposition did not admit of contradiction, that to ask our teachers to instil knowledge into the ill-nourished brains of underfed children was to ask them to perform, at best, a stupid miracle. Those acquainted with the subject knew that the first faculty of a child to fail under such conditions was the power of fixing and concentrating attention. And, when that power failed, the result was to have recourse to repetition. This became a more laborious and monotonous task both to the teacher and the taught. He agreed that there might be differences of opinion as to the machinery which should be adopted for accomplishing the object of the promoters of the Bill. For his part he should be disposed to say that opportunity should be given for considerable alterations in Clause 2. The Bill proposed to lay down that, if in any elementary school administered by the education authority there were any children who by reason of lack of food were unable to take full advantage of the education provided for them, the local education authority should take such steps as they thought fit to provide food for such children, and, if the local education authority thought fit, for any other children in their schools, under such regulations and conditions as the local authority might prescribe, and, if they so resolved, to make a charge to recover the cost from the parent or guardian, provided that no provision of food under the Act should be deemed to be parochial relief. He ventured to point out that the view might be held that the Bill went too far in one direction and that it did not go far enough in another. It certainly went farther than any Report of any official inquiry on the subject had yet recommended. The Bill was frankly socialistic in its tendency. He did not say that it was necessarily bad in consequence. It was quite arguable that as the State had made education free and compulsory, it should follow that up by seeing that the child was in a fit condition to take full advantage of the education provided. But there were many other conditions which unfortunately reacted on child-life, and which equally prevented the children obtaining full advantage of their education. Notably was this the case in regard to the condition of the housing of the working classes, and of children coming from the fœtid air of overcrowded dwellings. He rejoiced to think that the London County Council was sweeping away the slum areas. By so doing they had reduced the death-rate of these slum areas from 40 per 1,000 to 10 or 12 per 1,000 in the model dwellings. Without charity rents and by self-supporting housing schemes they had been able to do something to improve the conditions of child-life, and to enable these children to take advantage of the educational facilities provided for them. There were other directions in which it might be held that this scheme did not go far enough. He was perfectly aware that the condition of the clothing of the children who attended the schools was not all that could be desired. The Education Committee had urged the appointment of relief committees and had circularised the schoolmanagers in regard to this very question of clothing, and especially of boots in the winter time, in addition to providing for the underfed. He ventured to think that due justice had not been given to those voluntary charitable agencies which in the past had endeavoured to help with these difficult cases. He would also add that in regard to the summer holidays for the children, the committee which collected money for that most estimable purpose had obtained £17,000; and he would be sorry to reflect on what would be the effect on child-life if such an agency were brought suddenly to an end. While he fully recognised the value of charitable agencies he thought that if they were unaccompanied by inquiry they were sometimes calculated to increase the evils which it was sought by these means to remedy. The late School Board, having rejected proposals for rate-aided relief, appointed a committee to whom was committed the task of endeavouring to co-ordinate the various charitable funds which existed in London. The London County Council had continued this committee but had gone further and had embarked upon experiments. They had reflected upon the fact that in London there were some 200 cookery centres for the purpose of providing instruction to children. It was suggested to the London County Council and carried, that the experiment should be made that the means of production at their disposal at these centres should be utilised for distribution purposes. They had accordingly provided meals for children at 1½d. or 2d., and in a large percentage of cases the cost of the meals had been recovered from the parents. They believed that the experiment was appreciated and would be successful. In future there would be fifteen of these cookery centres, where meals would be supplied and where, when it was possible, the cost would be recovered from the parents, and when that was not possible it would be obtained from charitable agencies. Members of the committee had visited these centres, and he himself had inspected them and had been greatly impressed with the value of their work. Not only did this system prove an incentive to the production of more practical cookery but it had an educational value by giving some instruction to the children as to their behaviour at the dinner table. The officers of the London County Council had reported that so far as they could learn, the experiments had been successful. Personally he thought that the charitable source of income alone was likely to produce evil. He was not prepared to say that under no circumstances should rate or State aid be brought in to deal with cases of this sort, which he believed would be found to be a small minority, and he believed a decreasing minority. So far as they had been able to go with these cookery centres it appeared that they could not be made adequate to deal with all London. He noticed with satisfaction in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration the passage—

> "Circumstances, however, do arise which call for more immediate aid, and in which the school authority, taking into account the difficulty in the way of home provision of suitable food, and the number of children who attend school habitually underfed, are willing to provide regular and sufficient meals, and in such cases the Committee agree with the opinion of the Royal Commissioners on Physical Training (Scotland) that 'the preparation and cooking of these meals, where it is found necessary to provide them, ought to be regarded as one of the charges incident to the school management.'"

He entirely endorsed that statement, and personally he should be glad to see it embodied in a statute. If they had that power they would be able to ask their managers to take a greater interest in their delegated duties which dealt with the clothing and feeding of the children. But they had no powers at the present time, and they were unable to devolve this duty upon the managers. He could not speak too highly of the way that teachers in the schools had endeavoured to meet the case sometimes out of their own resources: one could not speak too highly of the zeal which they had shown in this matter. If he had spoken in any way critically of the Bill, it was not from want of sympathy with the object which the promoters had in view. He regretted to hear the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil declare in that House on the Address that three sides of the House were diametrically opposed to the interests of the working classes. He represented a constituency which was largely composed of working men. He was not a capitalist, nor a landlord, nor even an employer of labour. He was a member of a profession which was scantily represented in the House. He had had something to do with the work of London hospitals and had in this way been brought into contact with the workers and knew of their struggles. He believed that the workers were divided into two classes, those who worked in their black coats and those who worked in their shirt sleeves. As a hospital surgeon he rejoiced to reflect that he worked in his shirt sleeves. Knowing something of the struggles of the working classes, he could not, he thought, be accused of want of sympathy with them and the hardships they endured. He hoped the Bill would not be discussed with anything like scorn or contumely, but that the House would set themselves to find a practical solution of this great evil. He hoped, however, the Bill would be amended in Committee in some directions, and that by that means a practical solution would be obtained for what was now a scandal and a disgrace.

* MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.) said that upon the question of charitable contributions he had come to the conclusion that, if they wished to keep these agencies doing the work which they had done hitherto, they must provide some means of dealing with the school-meals question quite apart from charity. His experience had shown him that charity had almost reached the limit of adaptability to the various needs of the poor. There seemed to be the possibility of getting only a certain sum of money, and if it was got for one purpose it was not got for another. When subscriptions had been started in districts for meals for necessitous children, other charities had suffered seriously in proportion to the support forthcoming. To his mind there was no possibility of having that amount of continuity of charitable efforts which was needed for a purpose such as this. It was only at times of exceptional stress that the charity of the rich could be tapped, and when the emergency had passed the subcriptions ceased. This was, however, a permanent and not a temporary difficulty. There must therefore be some permanent means of dealing with it. The Committee upon Physical Deterioration found that—

> "It was a subject of general agreement that as a rule no purely voluntary association could successfully cope with the whole extent of the evil."

With those words he heartily agreed. Much was often said about sapping the independence of the people, but he knew of nothing which so much sapped that independence as the wild charity which created so much trouble by indiscriminate giving without having the power to see what was done with the gift. It seemed to him that, underlying some remarks made during the discussion by previous speakers, there was an dea that if they were to do something to relieve the material necessity under which people had to struggle, the desire to struggle would cease, and that, therefore, a greater mistake could not be made. But what was civilisation if it was not directed to freeing the people from material necessities; and if they could do that, surely the result would be that the struggle would be transferred to a higher plane, and the people would have the opportunity to fight for better things. Any Member of the House who had come to close quarters with the question would bear him out when he said that those portions of the community which were most subject to material uncertainty were the least responsive to any message coming from any man or woman who cared for the uplifting of humanity. It was only by setting the people free from material necessities that they were able to keep their attention on those matters which really concerned them more than material necessities. Therefore, he asserted that if this Bill could free human beings from some part of the material struggle, that struggle would still go on, but it would be a better and a nobler struggle than before. The question whether or not this step should be taken was a plain and simple one, and any Member of the House representing an industrial constituency who asked himself how many of the families in the constituency which he represented were in the enjoyment of an income sufficient to enable them to feed and clothe themselves would feel bound to give an answer to the question in the affirmative. He was able to speak for Bradford, and he anticipated that London was in an even worse position. But what were the facts so far as Bradford were concerned? Whole industries and trades were there carried on permanently under such conditions that the wage-earner could not maintain himself, his wife, and his bairns in comfort. He might take the case of the wool-combers; in this industry there were some 4,000 persons employed on the night turns, and he would like to ask what opportunity had they to maintain their families? Their wages, when fully employed, ranged from 18s. to 21s. per week, so far as a large majority of them were concerned. But there was no such thing as continuity of employment in their case. It was poor, casual labour involving waiting at the mill gates to see if it suited anybody to put it on for the night. Probably if he said that there was an average of four nights per week he would be overdrawing the picture, and certainly he was not exaggerating when he declared that, from year's end to year's end, slack time and busy time included, the wage did not exceed an average of 16s. per week.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Are these people organised in a trade union?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Do you mean men or masters?

*MR. JOWETT said the masters were organised, and the workmen also had an organisation, but the latter had proved utterly powerless to deal with a syndicate which weighed upon them like a nightmare. He was prepared to prove that a family of five persons could not possibly be fed, clothed, and housed, without provision of a single luxury, and without wasting a single penny at less than 25s. per week. But what was the condition of the children under these circumstances? What could be done for them? In his opinion there was one thing could be done, and that was to say to the parents, "You are not responsible for the system of society under which you live; the economic conditions have not been created by you; your children must be looked after, and they must be fed, if we are to lift our heads among the nations of the earth, and if we desire to keep our place in the civilised world." He heartily supported this Bill, believing it would do much good. There was only one other point he wished to touch upon. The hon. Member for the Glasgow University had stated that it would cost £12,000,000 to give effect to the provisions of the Bill. The hon. Member surely could not understand what the Bill proposed or he would never have made such a statement. After all it only proposed to provide for the feeding of necessitous school children——

*SIR HENRY CRAIK: The Bill is vastly wider. It gives power to feed all children.

*MR. JOWETT said that that interruption was entirely unnecessary. As a matter of fact, the Bill only provided for the free feeding of necessitous school children. It no doubt contained, and properly so, provisions dealing with other children, on whose behalf payment could be made, but the free feeding was confined to the necessitous class. Now he had gone very carefully into the matter, and in the course of his experience he had arrived at the conclusion that to provide one meal per day for necessitous children in a town such as Bradford, with its population approaching nearly 300,000 inhabitants, the cost would not exceed £5,000 a year. If that were so then a simple multiplication would show that the figures suggested by the hon. Member were ridiculous and were based on a complete misconception of the Bill itself. He trusted that not only would the Bill be carried, but that the system would be extended, because it was well known that there was nothing better than meal times for educating children in those little habits and details which were apt to polish and which made all the difference between some Members of the House of Commons and some others. Let them therefore adopt that means of teaching the children. It had been his lot to see two kinds of school feeding. He had seen children fed under the precious Order issued by the late Government, and he would ask what were the conditions which obtained under it? The children trooped into a room and took their stand in front of a bare table, whereas in the secondary schools the tables on which the children's meals were served were covered with tablecloths and were supplied with the proper utensils, while the teacher stood by ready to correct any little fault which he might notice, and the correction of which was in the interest of the children themselves. He did appeal to all sections of the House to unite in passing the Bill through Parliament.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he should like to move the following Amendment,—

> "That it is undesirable to proceed further with a measure which would diminish the responsibility of the parents for the maintenance of their children, and would tend to lower the wages of the poorer classes."

His reason for objecting to this Bill was that it dealt only with a symptom instead of with the disease itself. People saw that a certain number of children going to school were badly fed. They were horrified at the fact, and they proceeded at once to expostulate, but the remedy they suggested was merely to feed these particular children. But, surely, when a child was sent to a school improperly fed it meant that there must be something wrong in the home of the child. Obviously, then, the first thing to do was to ascertain what was wrong with the homes —in other words, before they dealt with the problem of the school children they must make inquiry at the homes as to what was the cause of the underfeeding of the children. This Bill provided no machinery for such an inquiry. Yet experience proved conclusively that where inquiry did take place then those symptoms which appeared to be so serious at first sight turned out to be comparatively unimportant in relation to other and graver diseases. He would take the case of Johanna Street School. The hon. Member for North Camberwell and other investigators about twelve months ago visited that school, and complained that a number of children were underfed. That complaint was dealt with by the Board of Guardians, who instructed their superintending relieving officer to inquire into the actual homes of the children and ascertain the causes of the under-feeding. What did he find ? In the first place, the parents in all the houses whence underfed children came were instructed to apply to the relieving officer if they wanted food. Only in one case was any application made. That alone seemed to dispose of the fact that it was impossible for the parents to feed their children. That was not all. They found in many cases that the incomes of the families ranged from 20s. up to as much as 72s. a week.

AN HON. MEMBER : These facts were subsequently challenged.

*MR. HAROLD COX said at any rate they had them on the authority of the Lambeth Board of Guardians. But what was more important still was that in many houses where parents were asked why children were sent to school without a proper meal the answer was something to this effect, "Oh, we heard that other children were getting meals for nothing and we thought ours might do the same." He would take another case—one concerning the children at a school in Chelsea. A number of inquiries were made, and he would mention a case as showing the kind of evidence that was furnished. A girl, aged eleven, was sent to school without proper meals. What was the report on her case ? She was an only child. Her boots were quite unfit for school. Her father was a painter, addicted to drink. What happened ? After a visit from the committee the father himself bought the boots which the child wanted. In another case, there were two children, aged eleven and nine, whose father was dead, and whose mother earned 10s. a week by mangling. That did not seem a large income out of which to provide meals for the children. But what the mother wanted for her children was not food but a country holiday, and so far had the woman proved her ability to provide food that she had paid 3s. 6d. for each child to the holiday fund, but they were unable to go away through want of boots and clothes. The Committee gave a grant, and thus the children had a fortnight in the country. He might go on multiplying these illustrations, but the point he wanted to make was that the feeding question was only one question, and often the least important. Boots were probably in nine cases out of ten far more important, as the children had more often good food than good boots; the clothing was important, and, above all, the housing was important. What was the conclusion ? They would have to begin not with the child, but with the family. They had to ask what was wrong in the family. Two things might be wrong in the family. Either the family might be honest but poor through adverse circumstances, or it might be drunken and dishonest. In the first event it was their duty to relieve the family as a whole, and not to pick out one child. In the second event, it might, in extreme cases of drunkenness or other serious vice, be necessary to remove the children from the family altogether. In the majority of cases, however, it would be sufficient to screw up the parents to a realisation of the duty that they owed to their children. The simplest way of accomplishing hat object, and certainly the least expensive, would be to placard the doors of the houses of parents who wilfully sent their children to school underfed with the simple announcement—

"These people send their children to school without feeding them."

AN HON. MEMBER: What a statesmanlike suggestion that is!

*MR. HAROLD COX said he could quite understand hon. Gentlemen on the other side objecting to his proposal, for he gathered from some of their speeches this afternoon that their object was to relieve parents of all their responsibilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is most unfair.

*MR. HAROLD COX said there was a provision in the Bill for allowing the local authorities, if they chose, to recover the money. Supposing they chose, how were they to do it? They knew perfectly well how extremely difficult it was to recover money from poor people. If parents' feelings of affection were appealed to they would provide food for their children, but once that food had been provided they would take good care not to pay the local authorities. They would consider that the money had been rained down from Heaven, and that there was no legal or moral obligation upon them to repay it. What a cumbrous officialism would be created! The point he was urging was that they should impose upon the parent the primary responsibility of feeding the child. What the supporters of the Bill proposed was first to appoint a certain number of officials to feed the child, and then to appoint more officials to collect money from the parents. When that had been done they would come to this House and object to any attempt to force parents to pay. Only two days ago the hon. Member for West Bradford asked the Home Secretary whether his attention had been called to a recent trial in the Bradford County Court, where Judge Bompas gave judgment against forty-nine parents for repayment of costs for meals supplied by the guardians. The object of that question was to protest against any pressure being put upon these parents.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said he desired to correct the statement of the hon. Gentleman. The object of the question was to protest against a judgment decided in forty-nine cases, in not one of which was evidence heard as to the means of the parents.

* MR. HAROLD COX said he was not prepared to go into the details of the question, nor did he think the House of Commons was a proper body to review judicial decisions. His point was that whenever pressure was put upon parents there would be some hon. Members who would do their utmost to resist it, in the name of Socialism. He had a further objection. He objected to the whole principle of taking one child out of a family and feeding it, while the rest of the family was starving. Many hon. Members opposite, he believed, were what was known as Collectivists, but there was already throughout the civilised world the closest form of Collectivism it was possible to create—the collectivity of the family bound together by the ties of service and affection. He laid stress on the word "service," for service led to affection. It was the little services that the mother tendered to the child that created and strengthened the bond of parental affection. They were proposing to put a stop to those services. [Cries of "No."] But it was a fact. They were proposing, when a family was poor, to take one child or two children if they liked, out of a family and say, "We will make you comfortable, but your brothers and sisters, your father and mother—they may go on in their hovel." [Cries of "No."] But that was what was proposed. They only proposed to feed the children in the schools, and not to deal with the poverty in the family. If there were real poverty in the family it should be relieved at the home. This scheme would lead to providing many children, whose parents were not really poor, not merely with meals, but with boots and clothing. What would be the effect on other families who had been doing their duty to their children? They would say, "There is Mrs. Smith; she gets her

children kept for nothing, and why should I be bothered to find money for my children ?" He knew there were a great many people who would resist such a temptation as that, but there were a great many others who were easily led astray. After all, human nature was a plastic thing, and could be easily moulded by environment. If the conditions were such as to conduce to a forsaking of duty, then in a great many cases duty would be forsaken. But this Bill did not even wait for the temptation to be given. It provided the temptation itself in the form of the offer of meals to everybody, whether necessitous or not, on the chance of getting back the money.

MR. CROOKS: That would be a better speculation than the war.

MR. HAROLD COX agreed that it would be just as bad a speculation. The inevitable effect of the Bill would be to lower wages, and in nine cases out of ten to increase rents. He would take the much less striking case of free education. In some cases the effect of the paying of the school fees by the Government had been to raise the rent by the amount of expenditure saved to the parent. But far more serious was the effect on wages. It was a commonplace that when a man had a pension he would work for a lower rate of wage than a man without a pension. In this case they were relieving the parents from what had been a heavy expenditure, and thereby reducing the necessity for high wages, and the parent would consequently be willing to accept lower wages. A few days ago the House passed a strong Resolution in favour of the extension of the Truck Act, but to-day they were actually proposing a new form of truck. They were proposing to give the employee food for his children in lieu of wages. The laws of competition being what they were, they would not be able to resist the tendency to lower wages. He was one of those antiquated people [AN HON. MEMBER: You need not tell us that] so antiquated as still to believe in trade unions. He did not know whether the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil believed in trade unionism, but many of the suggestions made by him would have the inevitable effect of destroying trades unionism. Trade unions depended on those members of the working classes who were strong enough not only to stand alone but to help their fellows. But the effect of this Bill would be to create a body of working men who, instead of helping their fellows and standing alone, would be sponging upon their fellow workers. What would be the effect on the child? [AN HON. MEMBER: It would be better fed.] If they took the child away from the home they would in the first place lower the standard of the home. ["No, no."] That might seem a striking statement to make, but it was borne out by the experience of people who spent their lives in working among the poorer classes. The duty of providing for a child was one of the greatest bonds in keeping up the standard of a home. A woman was ashamed to be drunk in the presence of her child. Take away the child and that motive for self-restraint was gone. He had been told of the case of a poor woman with an illegitimate child, who was working honourably to maintain it. Some charitable people thought it was very hard upon her to have to keep a child out of her scanty wages, and so they relieved her of her burden, and took the child away. What was the result? That poor woman, with no longer any stimulus to exertion or motive for maintaining a higher standard, dropped gradually down to the lowest depths of degradation.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) on a point of order said there was no suggestion of taking the children away from the parents.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member's observations were in order. I see no reason to interfere.

*MR. HAROLD COX said he was sorry he was not making his argument clear to his hon. friend, but he was pointing out that if they were to give meals they must also give boots and clothing. Then they must begin to ask under what conditions the child lived, what kind of rooms it slept in, was it washed before it was put to bed, and did it sleep in a decent cot at night. ["Hear, hear," from the LABOUR Benches, and cries of "Why not?"]

MR. CROOKS: We should do it; we should not ask.

*MR. HAROLD COX: Then the hon. Member's colleague had been a little slow in taking his point. When they had asked themselves these questions they were driven to say, "We must take this child away. We must house it somewhere else, where it can get better air, etc." They would house it in a beautiful building, with sanitary walls and provide neat little beds arranged in rows all exactly alike. They would feed it well at long tables with others and clothe it well, but there would be no holidays for that child. It would always live in this great barrack. ["Why?"] If the home was unfit for it in school time it was unfit for it in holiday time, and it would be a crime to send it back to the home from which they had rescued it. It would always live in this barrack with never a holiday and never a sight of the ordinary human relationships that mankind enjoyed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that in the Bill?

*MR. HAROLD COX: It is a consequence of the Bill. They had got, he said, to think in all these social problems of where they were drifting. His hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil was far sighted enough to see where he was going, but there were a great many Members on both sides of the House who did not see where they were going ["Oh, oh"], and where this Bill would lead to. When they had got these children fed and clothed, did they imagine they had made the children happy? Was there not something else which every child wanted—something that could not be provided by any Act of Parliament? Was there not love of home and parents? It was that love they were going to destroy, and when they had destroyed it they would put nothing in its place. They could not. Did they think they would have solved the problem of poverty? They would have only made more people willing to accept dependence upon others. It was not by such methods as these that they would raise the mass of the people to a better condition. In the long run they could only raise people by teaching them to raise themselves, but the effect of this Bill would be to encourage people to degrade themselves. He begged to move.

The Amendment was not seconded.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he was in the most cordial disagreement with almost everything which the hon. Member for Preston had said upon this question. His views to him seemed fantastic and hard-mouthed. Whether they were more fantastic than hard-mouthed he did not know. The hon. Member for Preston would allow a child to starve because he was anxious not to undermine parental responsibility, just in those cases where he knew it did not exist. He was entirely against the hon. Member. He considered it a most happy circumstance that the first private Members' Friday should be taken up with a proposal to give local education authorities the power to make provision for the feeding of hungry children. It was an equally happy circumstance that the proposition should come from the Labour benches, and that the first education debate was a real education debate dealing with a real, live, urgent problem. All too soon they would drift on to those empty dry theological discussions which had blocked educational progress in this House. For nearly thirty years he had been in daily touch with this problem. He commenced as a pupil teacher, then became an assistant master and subsequently a head master, and he for many years had been a member of the school board for London. He would give the House his views in regard to suffering from malnutrition. He was a master in a Bristol board school from the year 1884 to the year 1892 and there he had 250 boys in his charge. He watched them day by day and found that of the 250 every day, and especially in winter, at least fifty of the poorest boys were daily ill-fed and suffering from malnutrition, and twenty-five of them were absolutely hungry. From twenty to thirty boys always spent all the dinner hour in the playground. He asked a number of them—and the poor were always very reticent to expose their condition—whether they had been home, and some of them would say "Yes." Then he found that they had not been home for the reason that there was nothing to go home for. At mid-winter, when the hoar frost on the school playground was too severe to be penetrated by the rays of the sun, he once found two brothers sitting with their backs to the wall in the playground making a mid-day meal of a cold turnip, and he saw others making a meal off a crust and a raw onion. Although he admitted that things of this kind had been very much mitigated by charitable agencies, that state of things existed not more than fifteen years ago. Any morning, when the first bite of winter came along, they could see in the school children faint and vomit, not because their food disagreed with them, but because their stomachs were empty. That was a common experience of the board school teacher. Soon after he came to London there was a special Committee appointed to consider this question, and he could assure the House that this subject was far more serious than the matters they were accustomed to squabble over. A Committee sat in 1889 and it was found that 43,888 children, or 12 per cent. of the children on the roll of the London School Board, came ill-fed to school, and that voluntary agencies were not sufficient to meet the needs of half of them. It was therefore found that 6 per cent. of them came and went home hungry. In 1894 the Committee sat again and they had a very much better organisation of voluntary effort. In 1898, under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Costelloe, the Committee sat again and they concluded, after examining the facts, that in their opinion voluntary effort could not adequately cope with this difficulty, and they laid down three extremely important conclusions—

> "(i.) It should be deemed to be part of the duty of any authority by law responsible for the compulsory attendance of children at school to ascertain what children, if any, come to school in a state unfit to get normal profit by the school work—whether by reason of underfeeding, physical disability, or otherwise—and that there should be the necessary inspection for that purpose.
>
> "(ii.) That where it is ascertained that children are sent to school 'underfed' it should be part of the duty of the authority to see that they are provided, under proper conditions, with the necessary food, subject to the provision contained in Clause (vi.)
>
> "(vi.) That where the Board's officers report that the underfed condition of any child is due to the culpable neglect of a parent (whether by reason of drunkenness or other gross misconduct), the Board should have the power and the duty to prosecute the parent for cruelty, and that, in case the offence is persisted in, there should be power to deal with the child under the Industrial Schools Acts."

That was the position taken up by the hon. Member for Barnard Castle, and the hon. Member who had submitted this Bill to the House. He admitted that it was a fact that those findings were not accepted by the London School Board, because by twenty-seven votes to twelve they were defeated. While they were at work considering this question another independent body came to the same conclusion—he alluded to the Royal Commission of 1903 on Physical Training in Scotland. This was a most remarkable thing, for it was a Commission which had nothing to do with hungry children or the feeding of children. As the hon. Member for the Glasgow University knew very well, it was appointed to consider the methods employed in giving physical training, and the moment they got face to face with the hard facts they concluded that they could do nothing until those children were properly fed, and they added that an obligation should be put upon the public authorities to see that they were fed. That was a very remarkable finding from a body of persons who were generally supposed to be individualists to a greater extent than the other people of the United Kingdom. Then they had the most important finding of the Physical Deterioration Committee which had been quoted by the seconder of the Second Reading of this Bill to the effect that public authorities should be empowered to make provision for these children. That was what the Physical Deterioration Committee concluded. Having stated those short historical facts, he wished now to show how far they had been able to come to an agreement. All Parties agreed that there were a number of children, especially in the winter time, when the building and allied trades were out, in the slums of great towns, who came to school hungry and badly fed. He thought everybody must agree that bread was more necessary than the three R's to a poor child. They also agreed that it was torture to attempt to teach a child on an empty stomach, and they agreed that if they did make that endeavour they were wasting the rates and taxes just at the point where they ought to have the most fruitful influence, because of the physically unfit condition of the child. He thought they would all agree that they must do nothing to undermine parental responsibility, but on the contrary all their efforts should be directed to the maintenance of parental responsibility. They were all agreed that under that general system it would be economical, save money and time, and give cheap and good food to the children; and where the parent was in a position to pay he must be called upon to do so. Those who thought that the parent would not pay had little knowledge of the great sacrifices which the bulk of the poorer classes were making. They also agreed that if the parent could not make this provision as a result of illness, or economic conditions of the day, then the meal must be provided for the child without either pauperising the child or the parent. Further, he hoped it was agreed that if a parent could make provision for his child and would not do so because he was drunken or negligent, then he should be pursued with the utmost rigour of the law. There was only one point of difference. It might be asked, why could they not leave this thing to the hand of charity? That appeared to him to be the position taken up by the hon. Member for the Glasgow University, who asked if charity would not meet this case. He himself used to think that the proper way to deal with this question was by charitable organisations, but he had been driven from that conclusion by the hard facts of the case. Charity fluctuated, it was never certain, and they could not appeal except in mid-winter effectively to charity, and they all knew that there were cases even in summer where a meal was needed. There was a signal instanc given of this in this circular. The Physical Deterioration Committee reported in the sense they had heard, that the Local Education Authorities should be empowered to do this thing. He remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University was pretty well frightened out of his wits by that recommendation, and it so startled him that he appointed another Committee to explain the finding away and to consider the question of the feeding of children, restricting the reference to voluntary agencies, and this Committee reported in that sense. They were asked to examine how far voluntary agencies could do this thing, and what was the result? They got returns from seventy-one county boroughs and they found that in sixteen of them there was no provision of any kind whatever by voluntary agencies for the feeding of the children. The statement that voluntary agencies met the case was refuted by the fact that in the following county boroughs no agencies of the kind existed:—Barrow-in-Furness, Blackpool, Bournemouth, Burnley, Bury, Canterbury, Coventry, Exeter, Great Yarmouth, Huddersfield, Ipswich, Newport, Oxford, Southampton, Warrington, and Wigan. In a total of 137 boroughs no provision of any kind was made in ninety-nine for feeding the children through voluntary charitable agencies. In fifty-five urban districts no voluntary provision was made in thirty-three. He need not go any further than the Blue Book to show that voluntary effort was entirely inadequate to meet the case. Charity fluctuated, and it could never cover the ground. The charitable system was that which emasculated parental responsibility, because the parent was not followed up. The scheme of those who favoured the provisions of this Bill was to feed the child and then to pursue the parent. Personally he would take all the poorer areas of great towns and schedule them, linking the schools in those areas by half-dozens. He would then provide a central dining-hall for each group of six schools, and give the parents notice that they could go to the offices of the local authorities and buy a book of dinner coupons. They should pay for them if possible; if they were unable to pay they should receive them gratuitously to give them to their children to procure one square meal instead of permitting them to slouch about the streets picking up the garbage in the gutters. The teachers and attendance officers should also have coupons to give to the children; and when they had provided all this machinery, then they should pursue the worthless parent for all that they were worth. If the parent was a drunken, worthless person, who starved his child to indulge his own vices, then whip him at the cart tail. In citing the case of the *Cantine Scolaire* system in Paris, he showed that 8,000,000 meals were provided for children at a cost of £75,000. Of this sum, £15,000 were collected by voluntary subscriptions. They made a collection for these poor children's funds at all the public weddings. He thought that might be adopted in this country, for the right time to take people was when they were in the melting mood. The voluntary subscriptions amounted to £15,000, the parents themselves paid £20,000 for coupons, and the rates and taxes were mulct to the extent of £40,000. In London such a scheme would cost the rates a farthing in the pound. The rate was now 1s. 2d. in the pound, and they knew that at present a great deal of that money was wasted just where it ought to be most beneficently applied, because of the poverty of the people. By making the rate 1s. 2¼d. they would be sure of a thoroughly wise and fruitful application of every farthing of the money. He appealed to the House to give the Bill a Second Reading in the best and truest interest of the highest Imperialism—the Imperialism which began at home. He remembered reading with great interest a speech delivered at a city banquet by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham on 24th October, 1900. In that speech the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Think of it, gentlemen—Empire such as the world has never seen! Think of its area, covering a great portion of the globe! Think of its population, embracing 400,000,000 of the people of almost every race under the sun! Think of the diversity of its products! There is nothing that is necessary or useful or grateful to man which is not produced under the Union Jack."

That was an invitation to think Imperially, and they did. It was a very expensive job. They were thinking Imperially now when they thought of the poor little scraps of humanity on whose ricketty shoulders the burden of empire would in future rest. They were thinking of the future heritors and stewards of Britain's greatness when they thought of the Imperial citizens who were foraging in the gutters of the New Cut for the garbage that fell from the coster's barrow, hungry, barefooted, tattered and torn. They must not only sing "Rule, Britannia," but they must weave the chorus into every clause of our social statutes for the betterment of the people; and, while they did not forget the Arabs of Kordofan, they must remember also the little Arabs of the New Cut, Lambeth. They were discussing the Navy Estimates yesterday, and they would discuss them again next week, but he hoped they would remember, as they perfected their far-flung navies and ships of war, that it was not out of the mouth of knitted gun nor the smoothed rifle, but out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, that the strength is ordained that would still the Enemy and the Avenger.

*MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said the speech to which they had just listened contrasted strikingly with the pessimistic reflections of the hon. Member for Preston. Notwithstanding all the difficulties which had been enumerated, the question of the feeding of school children had taken a very deep hold upon the country. The question was now interesting all classes, and it was evident that the time had come when serious consideration must be given to it. There was an old truth that the wealth of a nation depended not so much on the weight of its bullion or its financial resources as upon the value and the quality of the blood and bone and sinew of its toilers. The report of the Commission of 1904 had been referred to by previous speakers, and if the statements which it contained were true it was high time that serious regard was paid to this particular question. They had the statement that a large number of children were unable, by reason of their physical condition, to do their work in a proper way. An important question which was engaging the attention of the country was how they could best develop and improve the physical condition of the people. From inquiries made from time to time, both by the Government and by charitable institutions, they found that there were conditions prevailing in this country which were certainly not creditable to a civilised community. Something needed to be done in order that the poorer portion of the population, many of whom were handicapped in the race of life, should be saved from a state of semi-starvation. Speaking at a meeting of the National League for Physical Education and Improvement held on 28th June, 1905, Sir James Crichton Browne said—

> "At thirteen years of age the children in elementary schools—those drawn from poor homes and the labouring classes—the boys are, on the average, two inches shorter and six pounds lighter than the boys in the secondary schools, who come from well-to-do homes; while, at the same age, the girls, on the average, are three inches shorter and thirteen pounds lighter."

Our educational system in the past had been largely devoted to the cultivation of the mental qualities of the children rather than their physical. This neglect had been inimical to the best interests of the nation. Body and mind were interdependent, and more interest must in future be shown in the question of physical development. At the meeting to which he had already referred, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War made a speech in which he said—

> "There are those who care for their country. The future of the country rests with the future of the race, and the race rests with the future of the children. You cannot have the highest education, you cannot have any education, unless you make those who are to receive it fit to receive it. You cannot save the soul unless you attend to the body. That applies in a great many fields of work, and it is not to be wondered at that the State should this session have been taking up the attention of Parliament with the question of feeding the children in the schools. Whatever difficulties there may be in these propositions, what people are coming to recognise is that education is a far bigger thing than mere learning, that it means attention to the physical conditions of life as well as the conditions which surround the mind, and unless the one is dealt with the other will fail."

This was really the humane aspect of the question, and that was one of the grounds on which the Party to which he belonged urged that a child should not be compelled to attend school unless they were satisfied that it was fit to undergo the strain required. There was also the commercial aspect of the question, and he thought that strong arguments could be found in favour of that aspect of the Bill. Every stunted child was a charge on the nation's resources; every well-developed child was a valuable addition to the nation's assets. Whatever might be the true definition of parental responsibility he and his friends said that every child born into the nation imposed on the nation a responsibility, and that that responsibility should be duly regarded. A good deal had been said about charity, and he admitted that benevolent men and women in the country had done much to soften the hard circumstances under which these half-fed children had lived, but there was conclusive proof that the method of dealing with the feeding of school children by charitable organisations was almost absolutely unsatisfactory. What the promoters of this Bill asked was that the power should be given to see that every child who was neglected should be cared for in such a way as would provide the best chances of its education being thoroughly attended to. The proposals in the Bill were in the first instance humane, and in the second place they were on economic grounds such as would promote the best interests of the nation.

Mr. J. W. Taylor.

*Mr ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham) said that he was not altogether in accord with the Bill before the House, but he did not wish to say very much in the way of criticism. All these questions, like those of physical deterioration, housing, casual labour, and unemployment, hung together. They were interlinked, and for the moment the House was working in a vicious circle, trying to find its way out. This was only one small point in the programme which they hoped would one day take them out of this vicious circle. At the present time the effort to get these children up the ladder of learning was a Sisyphean task. The moment they had mounted the ladder a little they left school, and many of them deteriorated physically and morally and joined the ranks of the unemployable and the inefficient. What the hon. Member for Preston had not noticed was that we were creating this problem day by day. We were manufacturing these classes and putting a burden on the rates and taxes just because we did not consider sufficiently the lives and the interests of the children. All our law and tradition put the man first, the woman second, and the child last of all. He did not contend that we ought to put the child first, but all these three ought equally to be regarded. The whole child problem needed more careful inquiry and study. If they could only solve the child problem he was convinced that they should have made, at any rate, some advance in dealing with the problem of casual labour and unemployment. The facts in connection with this question which struck him as being most impressive were those supplied by Dr. Hall, of Leeds, who for thirty years had made a close study of it, and who had himself engaged in the work of feeding school children. Dr. Hall found out almost accidentally that Jewish children were healthier, bigger, and taller than Gentile children, and this led him to go into the question more thoroughly by conducting a series of experiments in the feeding of children. He planned a scientific and wholesome diet for the children, and for many years he fed the children in the poorer class schools daily. As the result of his investigation he found that the children who were regularly fed with the right kind of diet were not to be compared with the children who came to school improperly fed, and so he urged that the whole child problem need more careful inquiry and study. He (Mr. Alden) did not think the present Bill would do very much; it was only one small measure, and he would like to see it supplemented in many ways. Any Bill which was to solve the problem must impose on local education authorities the duty of medically examining and inspecting every child at regular intervals. There should be doctors and nurses employed by every educational authority, whose duty it would be to go into the schools, especially those attended by the children of the poorer classes, and examine the children with the view of ascertaining what were the facts, so that they might have an authority which could not be impeached. What were the facts? He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman, the President of the Board of Education would see that these facts were ascertained in every town and in every country district. It had been pointed out that if children were fed without investigation into the circumstances of the parents they were likely to do more harm than good. If that was so, let them have investigation—searching investigation if they liked. If they chose to take the trouble they could find out the children who were living under such conditions that the parent could not possibly give them the necessary food. They had at hand the method which had been employed by Mr. Seebohm Rowntree in his investigations at York. Mr Rowntree's investigations proved that about 10 per cent.—9·91 per cent. to be quite accurate—of the population of York lived in what he called a state of primary poverty, and that the children of those people came to school ill-fed and ill-nourished. By primary poverty he meant a condition in which the total earnings of a family were not sufficient to provide the mere necessaries of life. The children must, therefore, necessarily suffer. They might make a beginning with the children of parents who were in a state of primary poverty. Could anybody dispute the fact that those children ought to be fed? If the parents did not wast a single penny on drink, holidays, recreation, or amusement, and if still the children could not be properly fed, hon. Members must be agreed that in such cases the children ought to be fed, not at the expense of the parents, because they could not afford it, but at the expense of some authority. Personally he should prefer that it should be the Imperial authority and that the money should be provided out of the Imperial Exchequer. He did not approve of putting an additional burden on localities which were already overburdened. Supposing they wanted to go beyond that stage, would it be impossible to make such an investigation by house to house visitation as would justify them in taking more definite action? He thought that what was wanted more than anything else was a knowledge of all the facts. If they could start with the schools and ascercertain the facts about child-life in the schools, he was quite convinced that many of the problems which vexed us to-day could be solved. Having had twelve years experience in the East end of London in the district of South-West Ham, he could state that he had seen children of the poor growing up utterly incapable of earning their living and gradually joining the ranks of the unemployed. He knew the case of a man who was sent to the United States. He was a teetotaler, a member of his trade union, a member of a sick benefit society, and a thrifty man. He did everything he could for his wife and children, but his wages as a casual docker averaged 12s. a week, and he paid 4s. 6d. a week for his two rooms. How was it possible for such a man adequately to feed his children, and how could the children be expected to learn when sent to school? Something ought to be done for the children in cases where it could be proved that the parents were not responsible in any degree for their poverty. He would leave it to the good sense of the House to say whether it was not time at any rate to make a beginning. He did not believe in compelling parents to contribute in the way suggested in the Bill. He did not believe that, because his own personal experience taught him that it was not practical. There were thousands of cases of families in which no amount of inquiry could bring home the fact whether the parents were or were not wholly responsible for the condition of the children. It was society that was responsible for manufacturing the conditions that made it so hard for parents to do what many Members claimed they ought to do. He pressed that point on the Minister of Education, and he asked him, in the interests of the children and the country to see that something was done, whether by this Bill, or by some clause in the new Education Bill, to give power to the local authorities to assist the children of parents who were poverty-stricken through no fault of their own. If that step were taken it would be first in the solution of the problem of unemployment.

*MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he hoped the House would forgive him, if at this very early stage of his Parliamentary career, he ventured to intervene in a debate of this character and importance. He did so with all the awe which this Assembly inspired in a new Member——

MR. W. REDMOND (Clare, E.): It never awed your father.

*MR. BOWLES (continuing): And with all that diffidence and modesty which he might say was natural to him, and which indeed he had perhaps to some extent inherited. He also did so, if the House would allow him to say it, because he confessed, as the humblest member of the Conservative Party, that he was outraged by the extraordinary proposals in the Bill now before the House. He had listened with the greatest possible attention to the debate, and he confessed that the speeches of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway had given him a very new conception of the character and fibre of the working classes of this country. If the case for this Bill was made out, they were bound to believe that there existed in this country a large number of men and women who had sunk into such a state of indifference and of sullen apathy as to be unmoved not by their own sufferings but the sufferings and starvation of their own children. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] It seemed to him unless that were so, it could hardly be necessary to make such provision as was contemplated by this measure. If there were such a class as that—he believed it was a small class—they ought to be dealt with by more forcible provisions than those contained in the Bill. It was claimed that the clauses of the Bill had reference to that much larger class of working men and women which undoubtedly existed, who were by no means indifferent to the sufferings of their own children, but who were unable to support them, and see that they were properly fed. It was suggested that those persons were unable through insufficient wages to support their own children. That might be so, but it seemed to him that if there was one thing which the men and the women of this country took care to do, under whatever conditions they were forced to live, it was to secure that their children should not be deprived of sufficient nourishment. His contention was that it was unlikely, in spite of all the expert evidence they have heard, that there was a large number of children who habitually, day in and day out, attended school without sufficient food. But suppose it to be true that a great number of children attend school in that condition, then, in his humble opinion, a Bill such as this would be a most mischievous measure in the interests of the whole country, and particularly in the interests of the working classes whom it was intended to benefit. What did this Bill propose to do? It proposed that the local education authority in any district might resolve that any of the children in attendance at any public elementary school under their control were insufficiently fed, and that then they might take certain steps. How was the local authority to resolve and how often to decide that a particular child was underfed? He supposed that if the education authority were to resolve they would have to make inquiry. In what form was it proposed to conduct that inquiry? Were they going to add to the already formidable, dangerous and weakening hierarchy of officials throughout the length and breadth of the land, whose business it would be to pry into the private lives of the people in order to ascertain whether on a particular day a certain child could be described as underfed? It seemed to him that if they were to carry out the proposals in the Bill they would inevitably set up a system of inquisition which, if he had any knowledge of the working classes in this country or in any other country, they would much resent and deplore. [Ironical laughter from the LABOUR Benches.] He hoped that hon. Members below the gangway did not think he had any want of respect for them when he said that he believed that they had not sufficiently considered the enormously far-reaching character of the proposals in the Bill. It had been more than once suggested in the debate that it was untrue to say that if this measure were carried it would be applicable to any child whether underfed or not. That suggestion could not for one moment be entertained. The Bill gave power to the local education authority to provide meals at the public expense for any children whatever, and under any circumstances where they might resolve that they would like to give such meals, altogether irrespective of whether the children were insufficiently fed or not. That provision to which he took exception had no place in the Bill of last year. It now read—

> "The local education authority shall take such steps as they think fit to provide food for such children 'as were unable by reason of lack of food to take full advantage of the education provided for them,' and, if the local education authority think fit, for any other children in their schools."

He maintained that if this Bill became law they would be putting into the hands of every educational authority in the country a power to charge the people of the district with the feeding of absolutely every child that came within its jurisdiction. That was a most tremendous power and would involve a great and increasing burden on the rates and on the people of this country. It seemed to him to be a very serious principle for this House to agree to, that the children of any parents were to receive the very substantial relief of food at the public expense, and yet not to be considered in any way pauperised. He contended that to give out of public funds—rates or taxes—food to the children of any district—they might call it relief or any other term they chose to give it—was to pauperise the recipients. For all these reasons, insufficient though they were, he was very hopeful that the House would consider well before passing the Second Reading of this measure. The fundamental objection to the Bill was its absolutely socialistic character from beginning to end. He thought that nobody would deny that. He held that all the well-known dangers which were known to adhere to all forms of socialism applied in a particularly virulent form to this measure. It might be said that he did not know much about the working classes—[Ironical "Hear, hear" from the LABOUR Benches]—but he knew a good deal about the working men of Norwood, and he could tell the House that they did not desire in the least—on the contrary, they very much disliked—this continual increase of county council inspection on every hand; and that they did not ask for a moment that their plain duties, which they were perfectly willing to carry out as citizens, should be fobbed off on the community as a whole, and that they realised and were ready to discharge their responsibilities in regard to their children and their families. He earnestly hoped, in the interests of the working classes, who, he believed, were the last people in the world who desired to live at other people's expense, and in the interests of those men and women who, with great self-sacrifice and unceasing endeavour, managed to keep their homes together and to pay their way as reasonable and independent folk, that the Government would advise that this measure should not pass into law as it stood.

*MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) said the hon. Member for Norwood had based his opposition to the Bill on the interests of the working classes. He thought the working classes were the best judges themselves as to what they wanted. There could be no doubt from the speeches they had heard to-day and from their own experience that the working classes did take a great interest in this question, and that, on the whole, they were heartily in favour of the Bill. The hon. Member for Preston had put his opposition to the Bill on a peculiarly arid ground of individualistic dogmatism. He seemed to be terrified by the Socialistic bogey. He (the speaker) refused to be deterred by any such bogey from supporting a measure which was in itself good and calculated to do good. If Socialistic measures were good, then in God's name let Parliament pass them. Another reason for opposition had been put forward by the hon. Member for Glasgow University, whose vaticinations, in respect of their gloom, had not been equalled since the Prophet Jeremiah lamented over Jerusalem. That hon. Member had told them that there were other questions besides this with which the House ought to deal. No doubt there were other questions such as housing, landlordism, temperance, etc., with which they hoped to have some opportunity of dealing effectively; but if they were to be deterred from dealing with a question because there were other questions to be settled, they would never deal with any of them at all. He should like to say that for more than thirty years he had been engaged in devotion to the physical exercise of rowing; and he found from observation and experience of generation after generation of young men who took part in that exercise that the generations recently come to manhood and now reaching manhood were infinitely better equipped in health, endurance, and strength, than the generation of about thirty years ago. He was convinced that that was so chiefly because in the schools from which they came they had had better food. The hon. Members for Norwood and Preston might say that they or their parents had paid for that food themselves. True, but when these young men aferwards represented their boat club in any important event their living expenses were paid by their club, and he had never yet heard that that had had a pauperising influence upon them. In the Bill before the House they had to deal with children whose parents could not provide them with food at all. If it was important that we should equip for the race of life the rising generation it was necessary that we should feed them if they could not feed themselves, and it was for that reason that he so heartily supported the Bill.

* SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said there had been a great variety of speeches, but, he believed, substantial agreement on one point—that there were a considerable number of children who attended elementary schools insufficiently fed and were unable to get the full benefit of the teaching given in the schools. It must not be supposed, however, that this state of things was universal. There were considerable areas and large towns in which the trouble did not exist. The hon. Member for North Camberwell represented that there were many county boroughs where there was no agency for the supply of food to children; he could say that in such cases there was no necessity for it there. He had taken the trouble to make inquiry in the county borough of Oxford, and he was assured that there were no children coming to school in that county borough who, to the knowledge of the teachers, were inefficiently fed. He believed we had the materials before us for dealing with the question, and he hoped it would be dealt with. He had heard with pleasure opinions expressed by various Members in favour of wise, cautious, and judicious administration of the supply of food to children. The question was, What were to be the conditions under which these meals were to be given, and who was to pay for them? He thought they were all agreed that the parent who could feed his children and did not, should be made to feed them by the most drastic measures. Then there were cases in which the parents

were perfectly willing to feed their children, but were not able to be at home for the purpose. Surely those were cases in which some arrangements might be made under which the local authorities might supply the meals and the parents pay for them. Then there were the far more difficult cases of distress. He thought the hon. Member for Preston was right in calling attention to the unfavourable effect which the giving of either rate or charitable aid might in some circumstances have on wages. [Several LABOUR MEMBERS: What about the poor widows?] There were cases of temporary distress in which, no doubt, relief might be given. Where was relief to come from? There were three alternatives—rate-aid, State-aid, or voluntary contributions. He could not see the objection to money being accepted from people who were willing to give it, and so coming into hands through which it might be properly controlled and administered for a useful end. He entirely agreed with an hon. Member who had suggested that charitable effort needed local control and that the local authorities should endeavour to organise the relief and to apply it to the best possible purposes; but he hoped they would not set aside a source of income which was ready to their hands in order to take money from the ratepayer, who was already so heavily burdened, or from the education rate, which was already heavily charged for education purposes, or go to the State. But there was another difficulty, and that was in the selection of the children who were to receive this relief. He understood from the earliest advocates of the Bill that the meals were not to be universal, but that the children who were to have them were to be those who would not otherwise get meals. By what agency other than voluntary agency could they ascertain what children should receive these meals? The mere statement of the children could not be trusted. He did not mean to say that the children were unprincipled, but when those who had had no breakfast were asked to hold up their hands, they were inclined to do as those near them did, and most of the children in a crowd would hold up their hands though they never meant to ask for anything to which they were not entitled. The teacher ought not to be asked to take upon himself the whole responsibility of the process of selection. From his experience at the Board of Education he could not speak too highly of the attitude of the teachers. They did all they could to help the children and their families and to exercise a humanising influence over the home. But they could not be expected to know all the circumstances of every family, and ought not to have this burden thrown upon them, and therefore he thought they must fall back upon the voluntary agencies such as the Guilds of Help at Bradford or those relief committees which existed in London and Sheffield and other large towns. This process of selection was an undoubted difficulty; and he feared that if the local authorities were given the large powers this Bill would confer on them they might be found to say that it was beneath the dignity of a great local authority to ask for charity or to use voluntary agencies and might take a short cut by taking advantage of the powers the Bill conferred and say that meals should be given to all those who could not afford them. It was said the Bill only gave power to the local authorities to deal with really necessitous cases; but if that was so, some of the provisions of the Bill seemed to him to be unnecessary. It was like the case of the man who made a large hole in his door for his cat and a smaller hole for his kitten. The provisions seemed to enable a large number of children to come in under one condition, and there was another condition under which any number of children could come in. In no case was the receipt of food under the Bill to be treated as parochial relief; and one result of the measure might be that a man who could, but would not, feed his children might get them fed at the cost of the ratepayer and yet incur no penalty or disability. It was suggested that the powers conferred by the Bill would be used in a most cautious and judicious spirit by the local authorities, but, in his opinion, they were dangerous powers to give to local authorities and would throw great temptations in their way and would be liable to great abuse. But would the evil really be remedied by the exercise of such powers? Would the supply of meals go to the root of the trouble? The poor and backward condition of the children in many schools did not arise only from the want of food. It arose also from the late hours to which they were kept up, from the impure atmosphere in which they slept, from the unwholesome food they were very often allowed to eat at home, and from the wretched state of their clothing and boots. Would all this be remedied by taking from the parent the duty of providing a breakfast and mid-day meal for his child? He contended that this provision of free meals should be administered with the utmost caution, because, if administered on a large scale, it would tend in some measure to increase rather than diminish parental carelessness, to which he must largely attribute the poor physical condition of many of the children in our schools. Would this be remedied by relieving the parent of the duty to provide a meal for the child before it went to school? Will they improve the home by taking away one of the principal features of home life, the duty of providing meals at settled periods of the day? He said that the power to provide free meals should be exercised with the utmost caution, for if they were administered on a large scale it would go far to diminish carefulness in the bringing up of children. The Board of Education and the local authorities had been doing all they could to encourage the teaching what was called housecraft, the arts by which the home was made wholesome and comfortable, and if there were to be free meals on a large scale, what was all that teaching to come to? The whole thing would bcome a matter of indifference to the parents, and, so far from advancing the condition of the poor, this Bill, if fully put into effect, would throw it back. He wanted to see this question settled on the lines which were set out in a Bill produced, but not discussed, in the last session of the last Parliament, which would have enabled local authorities to provide meals subject to payment and boards of guardians to deal with necessitous cases as they arose. He would like to see the Government take the matter up and deal with it on some such lines as these, and not in a way which, although it might get rid of the difficulty for a time, might create further troubles in the future and might retard the advance in the life of the working classes. They now had the materials before them, and he would very much rather see this matter taken up afresh than trust to making a workable Bill out of the Bill now before the House. It was quite plain from the speeches that had been made that the supporters of the Bill did not intend it to be worked upon the lines which the wording of the Bill now indicated. He despaired for that reason of making a good Bill out of the present Bill, but he would like to see the matter dealt with in a generous spirit, but judiciously and cautiously; and while taking every care for the interests of the children in regard to proper nourishment at school, this should be done so as not to sacrifice or damage the life of the home.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said they had had an interesting and profitable discussion, and many speeches had been made by new Members, who had shown an almost alarming capacity for taking an active part in the debates. It was a subject which touched all of them, this of hungry children in schools. Most Members of the House, he suspected, were fathers, all of them had been children, and some of them had been teachers, and in all these capacities they knew that to attempt to teach a hungry child, faint and weak, the elements of learning, either divine or human, was an act of cruelty. They also knew that to attempt anything of the kind at the expense of either the taxpayer or the ratepayer was a waste of public money. This was, therefore, in the first place an educational question. He protested in the name of the teachers against so odious a duty being imposed upon them as the attempt to teach hungry children. He knew quite well how generously teachers had approached the task, how kindly they had attempted to discharge it, and what a heavy tax it too often was upon their slender resources to try and mitigate the evils and the hardships that came under their attention. There was the hungry child; they must either feed it or turn it away; and as the Minister for Education he could not be responsible for the latter alternative. As everybody was agreed that the child could not be taught before it was fed, then fed it had to be. The next question was, By what agency was the feeding to be done? It appeared to him that the proper agency, in the first instance, to see that this primary step was taken was the education authority itself. As to whether or not local education authorities should have the power, if so disposed, to try the experiment of providing food for a considerable number of the children who might avail themselves of it, endeavouring to be repaid the cost of the meals, he reminded the House that that course had been adopted for many years in Paris, in connection with the *cantines scolaires*, and had worked exceedingly well. There was one advantage of teaching poor children what a good dinner was, that it raised their own standard very much, and created in their youthful stomachs a divine dissatisfaction with their lot. He could conceive no greater service to posterity than to raise the standard of living in the children of the present day. Therefore he should be sorry to forbid by law a local authority trying the experiment of feeding children upon a larger scale than would be necessary if it were to be confined to necessitous children. In Paris, in 1904, 10,500,000 meals were given; of those it was difficult to ascertain what proportion were given gratuitously, but it was certain that a very large proportion were given in exchange for payment. He thought that what Paris could do London ought to be able to do, especially after the visit of the County Councillors to the French capital. There it was found possible to combine a good system of feeding the children, which should be gratuitous to those whose parents stood in need of it without in any way interfering with payment by those who could afford to pay. That was the only reason why he should be rather sorry were the local authority to be prohibited from attempting to do something of the same sort as was done in Paris. That being so, the question became one rather of detail. What means were to be employed to see that they were not imposed upon? Of course, parental responsibility was a great ideal, but how it could really be destroyed either by free meals being given to very poor children or by meals being given to children for which they paid he was at a loss to conceive. He was not one of those who loved the phrase "the children of the State." It was a phrase which grated upon his ear. The State could not have any children. The mace on the table might as well beguile its ample leisure by the hope of a child. Man was born of a woman, and not of the Local Government Board, and anything which in any way interfered with the family as the unit of our civilisation was greatly to be deplored. On what rate was the burden to fall? Was it more convenient it should fall on the education rate or on the poor rate? Whether the education rate or the Poor Law rate was the better fund to bear the burden when they failed to recover the cost was a question which might fairly be considered by the Committee to which he hoped the Bill would be referred. He hoped the Committee would take into consideration the whole question as to how local authorities might work the powers conferred by this Bill. Charity was not to be sneezed at, but it required to be steady and well-organised, otherwise it was apt to be sporadic, fanciful, and fitful. He hoped, too, that local education authorities would fully consider whether they could not properly utilise voluntary agencies and organise and receive contributions from them in aid of the rate or any other relief they might think it necessary to establish. He did not suppose for a moment that any popularly-elected body, with ratepayers behind it, would be anxious to increase the burden of the rates, or that they would desire to discourage the assistance of charitable persons in the community. He thought it was not much use saying that this question was part of a far greater question—everything was part of a greater question. Everything was part and parcel of education. From the teacher's point of view, boots were not so important as that the child should be fed. This was a practical problem which presented itself every day in almost every school in the great towns, and we had to deal with the problem. He was quite content to leave posterity to deal with a great many other problems which might arise. He thought the best course would be, if the House ageeed, that the Bill should be read a second time, and then referred to a Select Committee. Its wording had, not unnaturally, given rise to suspicion from hon. Gentlemen opposite; there was a parenthesis that was a little difficult to understand, though the meaning which they attached to it had been very clearly explained by the supporters of the Bill. All that was needed was to make that meaning plain to the duller comprehension of His Majesty's Judges and others who might have hereafter to interpret it. When that had been done, and when the whole question of the relations of the local authority either with the Poor Law Guardians or with their own rate, and also their relations with the voluntary agencies which might exist in their midst, had been considered, he thought the Bill would come back to the House in a state which would enable it to pass with great satisfaction to all.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) expressed his profound regret that it should be proposed to send the Bill to a Select Committee. He agreed with the opinion expressed in the House some years ago by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, that to send a Bill to a Select Committee was a specious device on the part of those who did not wish to legislate. Having regard to the unanimity of opinion expressed in the course of the debate he sincerely regretted that the Minister for Education should have made this proposal, because it would mean in this case that they would not hear of the Bill again in the present Session, as by the time the Select Committee had concluded its work it would be practically impossible to make further progress with the measure. There had been practically no opposition either to the Second Reading of the Bill or to the main principles on which the measure was based. They had had one or two criticisms from hon. Members on both sides of the House who were apparently alarmed at the term "Socialism." Well, he did not think the junior Member for Merthyr Tydvil would suspect him of being a Socialist. But although he disclaimed being in any sense a Socialist he had never been afraid of the term. He was one of those who believed that what was right, proper and just in any "ism" would live, while that which was unjust and improper would die out. He therefore had never been terrified by the use of the word. He hoped that the Minister for Education would reconsider his decision and allow the Bill to go to a Grand Committee, where it could be just as effectively dealt with as by a Select Committee.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said it was impossible for any one connected with any one of our large cities not to feel much sympathy towards this Bill. Those who heard the very admirable speech of the hon. Member who moved the Second Reading must have had their confidence shaken in the statement as to the great prosperity of the working classes of this country in the King's gracious Speech. The hon. Member spoke in the presence of many of the right hon. Gentlemen who were responsible for the King's Speech, and when they heard from him that there were hundreds of thousands of workers, not excluding the skilled ones, whose aggregate wages did not exceed 18s. a week, they must have felt some doubt as to the truth of the paragraph in question. The hon. Member instanced a case within his own knowledge of a dock labourer, a teetotaller and a trade unionist, who was unable to earn a higher wage than 12s. a week and whom he assisted to emigrate to the United States. But why did he not tell the House what wages that individual was now earning under the entirely different conditions which obtained across the Atlantic? One of the speakers had quoted a statement by a former member of the House—Mr. Samuel Smith—to the effect that 10 per cent. of the children of this country were underfed, badly clothed and badly housed. Surely that was a matter for serious reflection which should be taken to heart by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He would like to be allowed to read one sentence. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Time."] Were hon. Gentlemen afraid to hear it? [AN HON. MEMBER: Reserve it till next Thursday.] No, he would give it again then. The sentence was from a report of the Birmingham Brass Workers' Committee, who declared that while in Germany they were greatly impressed with the cleanliness and tidiness of the children playing in the streets. In Berlin they saw not one who was not clean, neat and tidy. Again, he wished they had been told what the people in the United States did in this matter. He noticed that the hon. Member for Burnley had made a report in which he said that American workers were better fed than our own.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley): It is not my report. It is that of a namesake.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT apologised for the error, but said he had no doubt that the hon. Member concurred in the opinion of his namesake. He certainly regretted that the Minister for Education had not told them what America and Germany were doing in this matter.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I rise to a point of order. I have listened to the hon. Member for Sheffield for ten minutes, and he has not said a word either for or against the Bill.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said the hon. Member was mistaken. He certainly had not been speaking nearly so long as ten minutes, and in his opening sentences he declared that no one could view this Bill with feelings other than those of much sympathy. But he only wished to add a few words on the point of the recovery of cost. It had been shown that the number of cases was exceedingly small in which re-imbursements of expenses could be got in regard to children at reformatory and industrial schools, and he believed that to get re-imbursements under this Bill would be equally difficult. If adequate provision were taken to prevent any abuse of the Bill, and any excess of burden on the already heavily burdened taxpayer or ratepayer, he thought the Bill would be beneficial, and that it would do a great deal for the child life of this country. He should therefore most cordially support its Second Reading.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I beg now to propose that the Bill be sent to the Grand Committee on Law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, &c."—(*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) asked the House to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Education and refer the Bill to a Select Committee. The hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division had quoted a statement by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to the effect that reference to a Select Committee was a specious device on the part of those who did not want to legislate. That certainly could not be said either of the Minister for Education or of the Government in regard to this matter. Their intention was to respect the unanimity of feeling which the House had given expression to in that matter. He believed the desire of the House was that the Bill should be placed on the Statute-book this session, and in their opinion its reference to a Select Committee would facilitate rather than retard the fulfilment of that desire.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked whether that meant that, after the Select Committee had reported, the Government would put the Bill down in Government time? Otherwise the promise would amount to nothing.

MR. JOHN BURNS replied that, if there was any doubt about the Bill getting through this session, the Government were disposed to and would give Government time for the purpose. There were other reasons for sending the measure to a Select Committee. It must not be forgotten that there was an enormous number of well-disposed, charitable people who would want to know, and who had a right to know, how the voluntary efforts in which they had been so worthily engaged in supplying meals to necessitous children in various parts of the country would be affected by the passing of the Bill. They would want to know would it be possible for their efforts to be discontinued. The general tendency was, when a thing that had been done by voluntary charitable effort—whether good or bad, regularly or spasmodically—was being transferred from the domain of voluntary effort to state or municipal action, for the voluntary contributions to diminish, and it became necessary to make some provision for the interval between the two stages. It was necessary, too, that they should have some information as to how the Bill could be most easily worked and how the objects of all those who supported it could be most effectually carried out. Both these purposes could, he believed, be better achieved by sending the Bill to a Select Committee where the evidence of Government officials, representatives of various charitable agencies, and others could be taken, rather than by referring it to a Standing Committee. If was with no dilatory object that he moved, therefore, that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and he repeated that the Government would do their best to place it on the Statute Book this session.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'the Standing Committee on Law, &c.,' and insert the words 'a Select Committee.'"—(*Mr. John Burns*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said that he and his friends accepted the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, on the understanding that when the Bill returned to the House from the Select Committee Government time would be given for passing it through its remaining stages.

Mr. FENWICK said that so long as they had a positive guarantee from the Government that they would do their best to get the Bill carried through this session it was immaterial to him to what Committee it was sent, but he did hope that there would be no attempt to overload the Committee with evidence, so as to prevent the Bill coming back to the House before the latter end of the session. The President of the Local Government Board had in his speech indicated that there were a great many people who would desire to be heard before the Committee, and he therefore earnestly hoped that care would be taken to hasten its consideration.

Mr. CROOKS said he knew of one society which was bitterly opposed to them and who would talk for three years against the Bill if allowed to do so. He hoped that neither the Charity Organisation Society nor any other body would be allowed to delay this reform, and he suggested that the Government should promise that the Committee report within three months.

Question put, and negatived. Words inserted.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Select Committee.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), who was received with an Opposition cry, "There is no time now," said it was true that time was short and that it would be easy for any one who desired to talk the measure out to do so, but it was his duty with all respect to the House to move the Second Reading rather than sacrifice the remaining portion of the sitting. Under the circumstances he did not propose to repeat the general arguments in favour of the enfranchisement of women. He would assume for present purposes that the overwhelming majority of the House were favourable in some measure to the removal of women's disabilities. There was a difference of opinion as to the best first step, and as to the nature of the exact proposals to be made, but as regarded the principle of complete or partial removal of those disabilities there was now very little difference of opinion left. The various proposals made to the House had been far more limited in form up to the present, but since he first brought in this Bill—with very little support—a very great change had come over public opinion on the subject. The Bill had become the law of the Commonwealth of Australia, and the franchise part of it had also become the law in the great colony of New Zealand. In New Zealand the franchise of women had been carried to such an extent that there were far more women who voted in the great cities than men. It was thought that the enfranchisement of women would make an enormous political change, but neither the alarm of those who opposed the measure nor the hopes of those who supported it had been justified. There had been no great political change, and none of the effects which were expected had been introduced. In Australia the Labour cause had derived some benefit. But the great benefits of the change had been, in the universal opinion of opponents and supporters alike, that women had been interested in politics, and had taken a part in the public affairs of these colonies that they had never taken in the past. A sudden change had been noted lately with regard to the principle on which more limited proposals had been put before Parliament. In former years the advocates of such proposals were many of them strong Conservatives who were prepared to pledge themselves, if those proposals were accepted, not to proceed with larger proposals. Now, when the smaller proposals were advocated they were admittedly advocated only as a step to lead up to the larger proposals. Before that change took place it would not have been possible to get Parliament to consent to the principle of the Bill now before the House. It seemed to him that in this matter the supporters of the measure were bound to face the facts, and were bound to make deliberately to the House of Commons those proposals which they really desired to make and which they always meant to make. The franchise could not be touched until the House was prepared to grasp this question. A great many Members were pledged to Registration reform, but when asked what they meant by that, the first example given was generally the sweeping away of the money qualification of the lodger franchise and virtually reducing the lodger franchise to manhood suffrage. They could not deal with the difficulties of our seventeen different franchise systems by means of any scheme of Registration reform. They could only be dealt with by a Franchise Bill. Up to within a few years ago a large body of the workers of this country desired manhood suffrage. At the present moment that movement was almost extinct, but it was not possible to find many of its former supporters who were not in favour of the principle which lay at the root of this Bill. If we were to have any franchise reform at all, if we were to have any large registration reform, this question must be faced, and the moment they began to face the question they could not merely stop at removing the sex disability, they must face the question of marriage disability as well. He begged to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he desired to say a few words upon this measure, because he did not think that the House would have gathered any concrete idea of the contents of the Bill from the speech just delivered to the House introducing it on its Second Reading. He was glad that this measure had been introduced, because he thought when the electors of the country realised the kind of measures which the Radical Party desired to pass into law, they would begin to regret their verdict at the recent elections. He should like to have this Bill and the right hon. Baronet's speech placarded throughout the country. The Bill proposed a complete revolution, not only with reference to woman's suffrage, but with regard to every portion of the Statute Law and Common Law affecting the franchise of this country. The first clause provided that—

> "Every man and every woman of full age, whether married or single, shall be qualified to vote at Parliamentary or local elections who resides in the area for which the election is held and is duly registered, unless disqualified for reasons other than sex or marriage by Common Law or Act or Parliament."

That swept away all qualifications except those of full age and residence. The second clause proposed to empower His Majesty, by Order in Council, practically to create a complete new code of franchise law. That was a reversion to the practice of the Constituent Assembly at the French Revolution.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE said that in that case the Bill followed the precedent of recent legislation where matters of this kind were dealt with by Order in Council.

Lord R. CECIL said that it laid down a principle, and left the details to be carried out by subsequent legislation. A great deal depended upon the way in which these details would be settled. Under the second clause they would leave His Majesty in Council to settle such questions as plural voting, the period of residence, the place of residence, and how far one could carry their right to a vote from one residence to another. He also thought that a proposition of the sweeping character of the third clause, as to which the right hon. Baronet had said nothing at all, dealing with the University representation, should have been brought to the attention of the House more fully in the right hon. Baronet's speech. He could not conceive how any one desiring to advance woman's suffrage could include provisions which must excite so much hostility. He was, and had always been, personally in favour of woman's suffrage, but was unable to support such a measure as this. The right hon. Baronet had presented the matter as a question of woman's suffrage, but he did not in fact give any reason why he thought it was desirable that women should be enfranchised. He would, with permission of the House, say a few words upon that question. In the first place, the argument commonly used in favour of woman's suffrage was that a woman who exercised the right of a householder and paid the rates ought to have a right to exercise the franchise in the same way as a man. That argument was not a sound one. No man, in his opinion, had a right to vote; it was a question of expediency. He could not support this Bill upon that ground, nor did he think women needed the franchise because their interests had been unduly disregarded in the legislation of this country. He did not think there was any question on which women did not exercise their full influence, although it might be an indirect influence. The one ground which he did think justified their claim for the extension of the suffrage was that there were certain questions on which he believed they would support the opinions he held. Hon. Members were amused and seemed to regard that as a ridiculous assumption, but that was the only ground upon which the extension of suffrage could be granted, because his opinions must be wise opinions, otherwise he should not hold them. It was because he believed that women would support him in the questions he had most at heart, and because he believed that the cause of religion and the cause of education would be safer, that he was in favour of woman's suffrage. He had recently had some doubt as to how far that opinion was justifiable, for the reason that there were in his constituency as many as 5,000 women who were entitled to vote at municipal elections, and it had been found impossible by those who organised the elections to induce many of those women to vote, and if they did not take the trouble to exercise the franchise they had got, it was, in his opinion, very doubtful as to whether they would take the trouble to exercise the franchise which this Bill proposed to confer upon them. The fourth clause in the Bill, which would permit women to exercise any public function whatever, illustrated again the difficulties put in the way of a moderate supporter of woman's suffrage by this Bill. He moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

* Mr. TALBOT (Oxford University), in seconding the rejection of the Bill, said that this was practically a Reform Bill; a Bill for the remodelling of the whole of our franchise laws, yet the right hon. Baronet in the last half-hour of a short sitting, during which they had been discussing a question of quite a different nature, got up, and proposed a Bill of this character, in one clause of which he proposed to sweep away the whole of the University franchise. He thought that was not very respectful to the Universities of this country, and he complained that the proposals relating to University representation had not received more ample explanation.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. KEIR HARDIE said that the noble Lord's sole ground for approving woman's suffrage showed that he had no claim to be considered even a moderate supporter of it. He was only a supporter of woman's suffrage in so far as he believed that women would support him, and any woman in this country who had any interest in politics and respect for herself would resent any support of that kind. He approved of every line of the Bill. He also believed it to be an indispensable step towards securing the object aimed at in the Bill to remove at once the sex barriers which prevented women from being citizens at all, and thus do away with a great injustice.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the Bill was of a far-reaching character, which even contemplated that women might sit in the Chair of this House.

And, it being half-past Five of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

NEW BILLS.

Leave was given to introduce the following Bills, which were brought up and read a first time.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): Bill to prevent a time limit being set upon the use of passenger tickets.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): Bill to amend the law relating to the qualification and registration of Parliamentary voters; and for other purposes relating to elections.

RAILWAY TICKETS.

Bill to prevent a time limit being set upon the use of Passenger Tickets, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Morton, Mr. Rowlands, Mr. Ernest Lamb, Mr. Weir, Mr. John Hope, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and Sir Howard Vincent.

RAILWAY TICKETS BILL.

"To prevent a time limit being set upon the use of Passenger Tickets," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 65.]

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (REGISTRATION).

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters; and for other purposes relating to elections, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cremer, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Bell, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. John Ward, Mr. Maddison, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (REGISTRATION BILL).

"To amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters; and for other purposes relating to elections," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 66.]

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

STATEMENT EXPLANATORY OF NAVY ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

The Estimates for 1906–7 amount to 31,869,500*l.*, as opposed to 33,389,500*l.* for the current year, a reduction of 1,520,000*l.* The method by which this reduction has been obtained is described in one of the Appendices (Estimates Committee) to the Blue Book, "A Statement of Admiralty Policy" (Cd. 2791), issued by my predecessor in November last, anticipating much of that usually made on presentation of the estimates. The present estimates are substantially in agreement with the forecast given in that Statement.

The following is the usual statement of work done by the various departments of the Admiralty during the present financial year.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FLEET.

Mediterranean.

The Battleship Squadron, consisting of eight ships of the *Formidable* class, has remained unaltered. The Second Class Cruisers attached to it have been reduced, by the withdrawal of the *Juno*, to three ships of the *Talbot* class.

In the Third Cruiser Squadron the Armoured Cruiser *Carnarvon* of the *Devonshire* class has replaced the *Aboukir*. The Repair Vessel *Vulcan* has been appropriated for special service with the Mediterranean Destroyers affiliated to that Squadron.

North America and West Indies.

In the Fourth Cruiser Squadron, the *Royal Arthur* has replaced the *Ariadne* as Flagship, and the *Edgar* has relieved the *Gibraltar*. The *Eclipse* was temporarily added but has now been withdrawn and has been attached to the Royal Naval College, Osborne, in place of the *Hermes*. The *Diamond*, which was attached to the Fourth Cruiser Squadron for permanent Service in the West Indies, has been replaced by the *Indefatigable*.

The Sloop *Fantome* has been brought home from Halifax and will shortly be fitted for Surveying service. Three Cruisers of the *Apollo* class have been employed in connection with the Newfoundland Fisheries and are now proceeding on a cruise along the East Coast of South America and the West Coast of Africa under the Commodore Sir Alfred Paget.

China.

Considerable changes have been made in the China Squadron. All the Battleships have been withdrawn, while of the Cruisers the *Amphitrite* has been replaced by the *Diadem*, and the *Sutlej*, *Hogue*, and *Andromeda* will shortly be relieved by the Armoured Cruisers *King Alfred*, *Kent*, and *Donegal*. The Second Class Cruiser *Bonaventure* was transferred from the Pacific Station to relieve the *Thetis*, but is now about to be withdrawn from the China Station, and the *Flora* has replaced the *Iphigenia* and *Sirius*.

The two sloops *Cadmus* and *Clio* have been transferred from the Australian to the China Station. The Gunboats *Bramble* and *Britomart* will shortly be put in commission on the Station for service on the rivers. The shallow-draft Steamer *Nightingale* is being sent out from England, making ten vessels of this type on the China Station, for river work.

Australia.

The *Powerful* has relieved the *Euryalus* as Flagship.

This Squadron has been strengthened by the addition of the Second Class Cruiser *Cambrian.* The Third Class Cruiser *Wallaroo* has been withdrawn and the Second Class Cruiser *Encounter* has joined the Station.

The *Psyche*, *Pyramus*, and *Pioneer* have replaced as Drill Ships the *Katoomba*, *Phœbe*, and *Mildura*. The five Third Class Cruisers now on the Station are all of the same type. The Sloop *Torch* has been paid off and laid up at Sidney, and there are now no vessels of this class on the Station.

East Indies.

The *Hermes* has replaced the *Hyacinth* as Flagship.

The *Renown*, and the escorting ship the *Terrible*, which were placed at the disposal of Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, have been visiting various ports on the East Indies Station.

Cape of Good Hope.

No alteration has taken place with the exception of the relief of the *Barrosa* by the *Pelorus*.

Atlantic Fleet.

This Fleet now includes eight Battleships, viz., five of the new *King Edward VII.* class and three of the *Majestic* class. The vessels replaced have been the *Cæsar*, *Hannibal*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, and *Illustrious*.

The *Arrogant* has replaced the *Doris* as one of the Cruisers attached to the Battle Squadron.

In the Second Cruiser Squadron, which is affiliated to the Atlantic Fleet, it is intended to replace two of the *Monmouth* class Cruisers shortly by two Cruisers of the new *Duke of Edinburgh* class.

Channel Fleet, including First Cruiser Squadron.

One of the chief features of the past year in the distribution of H.M. ships has been the strengthening of the Channel Fleet.

The number of Battleships has been increased to 17, and the composition of this Fleet will shortly be as follows: six Battleships of the *Duncan* class, five of the *Canopus* class, four of the *Majestic* class and the *Triumph* and *Swiftsure* (ex Chilian ships).

The Cruisers attached to the Battle Squadron have been augmented by the *Juno*, transferred from the Mediterranean.

APPENDIX I.

The *Sapphire* and the Home Torpedo Boat Destroyer Flotillas are now attached to the Channel Fleet. The *Sapphire* has become the Flagship of the Rear-Admiral (called the Admiral (D)) who has been appointed in command of all Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Torpedo Gunboats (except those employed on fishery duties), Torpedo Boats and Submarines in full commission and in commission in Reserve. Three Scouts will shortly be employed on service with the Destroyer Flotillas.

In the First Cruiser Squadron, affiliated to the Channel Fleet, the *Roxburgh, Antrim, Devonshire,* and *Argyll* have replaced the *Kent, Bedford, Donegal,* and *Monmouth,* and the *Hampshire* has been added. The *Good Hope* remains the Flagship.

Home Ports.

The *Actæon* has been commissioned as the new Torpedo School at Sheerness.

The *Fisgard* and the *Tenedos*, formerly Stationary Depot Ships for Destroyers, have been appropriated for Boy Artificers' Training Establishments at Portsmouth and Chatham, and the *Assistance*, temporarily used as a training ship for Boy Artificers, has been transferred to the Atlantic Fleet as a Repair Ship. The *Indus* has recently been commissioned as the new Mechanicians' Training Establishment at Devonport.

The *Mercury*, hitherto employed as Navigational School Ship, has been relieved by the *Dryad* and *Harrier*, and has been placed under the Inspecting Captain of Submarine Boats, as Submarine Depot Ship. *Sapphire II.* (formerly *Imperieuse*) has become the Depot Ship at Portland for Torpedo Boat Destroyers.

Considerable alterations have been made in the Harbour Training Ships for Boys; the *Boscawen* has been paid off and *Boscawen II.* and *III.* have been removed from Portland to Harwich and made tenders to H.M.S. *Ganges*, the ship attached to the new Training Establishment for Boys at Shotley. The *St. Vincent* and *Caledonia*, Training Ships at Portsmouth and Queensferry, have been paid off.

Coast Guard and Fishery Service Vessels.

The Seagoing Royal Naval Reserve Drill Ships have been paid off, as it has been decided to train Reserve men in the ships of the Divisions in Commission in Reserve at the Home Ports. After the 1st April next the Harbour Drill Ships, with the exception of those at London, Aberdeen, Bristol, and Liverpool, will be discontinued.

Five of the Torpedo Gunboats are being transferred from the Admiral Commanding the Coast Guard and Reserves to the Admiral (D).

Visits.

Besides the visits mentioned in the "Statement of Admiralty Policy," page 29, a visit was paid by a French Fleet to Portsmouth in August, and by the China Squadron to Japan in September and October.

H.R.H. Prince Arthur of Connaught proceeded from England on a special mission to Japan, embarking at Hong Kong in H.M.S. *Diadem*. The *Diadem* will remain in Japan during His Royal Highness' stay.

Manœuvres.

Combined battle exercises were carried out by the Mediterranean and Atlantic Fleets last May, and again in August.

APPENDIX I.

The Reserve Divisions engaged in manœuvres last July with Squadrons selected from the Channel Fleet, First and Fourth Cruiser Squadrons, and Destroyer Flotillas.

Torpedo Craft exercises have been taking place in Home Waters, and combined exercises of the Channel, Mediterranean, and Atlantic Fleets, and First, Second and Third Cruiser Squadrons are now in progress on the coast of Portugal.

PERSONNEL.

Officers.

The new Royal Naval College at Dartmouth has been practically completed, the first term of Cadets entered at the R.N. College, Osborne, having been transferred to Dartmouth in September 1905. The *Britannia* Training Establishment was closed at the same time, the cadets then under instruction being embarked on two Cruisers for the purpose of completing their instruction under the old conditions. The headquarters of the Cruisers was established at Bermuda, where suitable arrangements had been made for the convenience of the Cadets. The Cadets entered in September under the old system and those entered in January 1906 (the last to be so entered) were received at the Royal Naval College, Dartmouth, where they are instructed as far as possible side by side with the Cadets transferred from Osborne.

Mr. Charles Godfrey, Assistant-Master at Winchester College, was selected as Head Master of the R.N. College, Osborne, in succession to Mr. Ashford, who was transferred to Dartmouth in September.

The selection of candidates for Cadetships continues to be made under the scheme laid down in 1903, and the reports presented to Parliament in 1905 (Cd. 2450) were favourable to the system by which all candidates appear before the Interviewing Committee before being selected for the final qualifying examination.

The organisation and staffs of the Cadets' Colleges have been reviewed, and various economies have been introduced, including a simpler and more wholesome dietary.

The question of the training of Naval officers and their appropriation for Specialist Branches, such as Gunnery, Engineering and Marine, received further consideration in the course of the year, and a full statement in regard to this important subject was set forth in the Parliamentary Paper (Cd. 2791) published in December 1905.

The arrangements for the study and examination of Midshipmen have been revised. In future Part I. of the Examination will be held three times a year, and young officers will be expected to present themselves on their return from sea, without any preliminary course of study at the Royal Naval College. An executive officer will be detailed in every ship for supervising the instruction of the Midshipmen, whether a Naval Instructor is borne or not. The examinations in Seamanship will also be held at fixed dates three times a year.

The School of Navigation will be located in future at the College in Portsmouth Dockyard, and the Sub-Lieutenants will go through their Pilotage Course here instead of at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich.

A beginning has been made with the scheme of sending abroad Assistant Clerks of the Accountant Branch for study of foreign languages. Six young officers were selected in October 1905, four being sent to France, and two to Germany, and so far the reports of their progress are satisfactory. Six more were detailed for study abroad in January 1906.

APPENDIX I.

The War Courses for Officers, which were formerly held at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, have been developed and rearranged. In future these courses will be held at a Naval Port, where it is hoped that a large number of officers will be able to take advantage of this important aid to their professional training. The first course under the new system is being held at Devonport; the next one will begin at Portsmouth at the beginning of March 1906. Portsmouth presents special advantages for the holding of the war courses, and it is under consideration to treat this port as the centre of the Naval war courses.

Men.

The completion of the Boys' Training Establishment at Shotley has enabled the Admiralty to carry out their policy of paying off the old Training Ships and concentrating the training of boys. The training of boys on entry is now practically divided between Shotley and Plymouth, a very few boys being still entered in the *Emerald* at Queenstown.

The period of shore training of boys has been further reduced, corresponding to the older age at which they are entered, the total being eight months in the Shore Establishment and four months in the Seagoing Cruisers. A certain rearrangement of the periods and subjects of instruction has been made at the same time so as to secure more thorough instruction for the smarter boys. Boys who have completed their training in the shore establishments are now sent to the ships of the Reserve Squadrons pending draft to the Seagoing Cruisers.

The training of youths continues to be carried out as arranged last year. They are first put through a preliminary course of about two months' training in the *Boscawen III.* at Shotley, and are then sent afloat in a Seagoing Cruiser for four months in the same manner as the boys.

The entry of Special Service men has been attended with satisfactory results throughout the year, especially in regard to Stokers. After undergoing the preliminary training in the depots, these men are sent for a short period to ships of the Reserve Squadrons while waiting draft.

As explained in the "Statement of Admiralty Policy," various changes are proposed in regard to the training and advancement of Engine-room ratings. Warrant rank has been thrown open to the Stoker class. The training of Boy Artificers and Stokers qualifying for Leading Stoker and Mechanician has been placed under an Inspecting Captain of Mechanical Training, the training of Boy Artificers being limited to the ports of Portsmouth and Chatham, and that of Mechanician being concentrated at Devonport only.

With a view to reducing the numbers of non-swimmers in the Fleet, directions have been issued for general swimming instruction to be given for half an hour daily in all ships, and for arrangements to be made in suitable localities for parties of non-swimmers to be sent away for instruction to swimming baths, &c. The test of ability to swim has also been raised, and arrangements have been made for advanced classes in life-saving to be formed among the more proficient swimmers.

Coast Guard.

The reorganisation scheme of 1903 is now fully established and works very satisfactorily. New Coast Guard Instructions have been completed and issued.

A considerable reduction has been made during the last year in the personnel and the buildings of the Coast Guard.

Stations which required extensive repairs, or where the quarters were found no longer suitable, have been closed.

The estimated numbers of the Coast Guard personnel for 1906–07 will be 4,122 as compared with 4,369 for 1905–06.

Improvements have been made in regard to the efficiency of the Signal Stations. A Signal Boatswain has been added to the staff of the Admiral Commanding Coast Guard and Reserves, and has been found very useful in carrying out certain periodical inspections of the crews of these Stations.

The Wireless Telegraph Stations are now worked entirely by the Coast Guard. Of these, two have been opened during the present financial year, and another is now being opened as an intercepting station temporarily. In addition three more stations are to be erected next year.

Royal Marines.

It was decided to reduce the establishment during the current financial year from 19,800 to 18,261, *i.e.*, by 1,539; of this reduction 200 will be in the Royal Marine Artillery and 1,339 in the Royal Marine Light Infantry.

The Royal Naval School of Music, which was established in 1903, has made steady progress during the year. The present number of Band Ranks for service afloat has reached 950, the number originally authorised to be borne during the financial year. Twenty-seven Bands under the new scheme are now embarked in H.M. Ships.

The rating of Turret Gunlayers and Turret Sightsetter has been recently thrown open to the Royal Marines, and six have qualified for the former and thirteen for the latter rating. 679 Qualified Men (Q.M.) R.M.L.I. are fully trained and available for employment in their Gunnery rating.

Owing to the exigencies of the Naval Service, Royal Marine Officers have in the past experienced some difficulty in presenting themselves for examination for promotion at Army Centres. Arrangements have recently been made with the War Office to provide for the literary part of the examination of Royal Marine Officers being held in any ship and in any part of the world in which they may be serving, but the examination in practical handling of troops in the field will still have to be carried out at a Military Station. It is thought that this change will, to a large extent, obviate the necessity for provisionally promoting officers who have not passed the prescribed examination owing to want of opportunity.

Royal Naval Reserve.

The number of Royal Naval Reserve officers and men having reached requirements, entries have been temporarily suspended during the year.

Early in the financial year 1905–6 three months' training on board the ships of the Reserve Divisions was substituted for training on board special seagoing Drill Ships, allowing the latter to be withdrawn, and thereby effecting a large economy. It also tended to greater efficiency as the ships of the Reserve Divisions are more efficiently armed vessels.

Considerable alterations in the system of training officers and men of the Royal Naval Reserve will come into force on 1st April next, as explained in the "Statement of Admiralty Policy" previously referred to. All drill and training are in the near future to be carried out in effective ships in commission instead of at Shore Batteries and in Harbour Drill Ships.

APPENDIX I.

Five Harbour Drill Ships will be paid off and 25 Batteries closed on 31st March, 1906, the remaining four Harbour Drill Ships and eight Batteries being retained for a period in no case exceeding five years.

The strength of the Royal Naval Reserve (Home) on 31st December, 1905, was :—

Executive Officers - - -	1,599	1,998	29,727
Commissioned Engineer Officers -	329		
Warrant Engineer - - -	70		
Engine Room Artificers - -	543	27,729	
Seamen Rating - - - -	20,719		
Firemen - - - - -	6,467		

On the same date 386 officers on the Active List had already undergone 12 months' Naval Training and are in receipt of Training Fees.

Sixty-six officers are now undergoing the year's Naval Training, or have been appointed.

The strength of the Colonial Royal Naval Reserves is as follows :—

Colony.	Officers.	Men.	Date of Return.
Australasia - -	5	293	1st November 1905.
Newfoundland - -	—	560	31st December 1905.
Malta - - -	—	366	1st January, 1906.
	5	1,219	

Royal Fleet Reserve.

The numbers of this Reserve have been considerably augmented during the year 1905, both through the normal wastage from the Active List and also through the special arrangement which was authorised last year to which reference was made in the last Statement.

The total strength of the Royal Fleet Reserve on 31st December, 1905, was :—

———	Class A.	Class B.	Total.
Seamen, &c. - - -	2,990	4,778	7,768
Stokers - - - -	958	1,376	2,334
Marines - - - -	1,590	2,621	4,211
	5,538	8,775	14,313

Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

A new Division of the Tyne has been established, and the present strength of the whole force is as follows :—

APPENDIX I.

Permanent Staff.

Officers	6	60
Petty Officers and Men	54	

Royal Naval Volunteers.

Officers	138	3,537
Petty Officers and Men	3,399	

During the year opportunities have been given to the Naval Volunteers to embark for periods of 14 or 28 days in the ships of the Reserve Divisions, and about 1,120 officers and men took advantage of this.

Officers and men have also been permitted to go through special courses of Gunnery, Torpedo and Signalling.

Reports on them received from the Captains of the ships are most satisfactory.

The Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve includes now a considerable proportion of men acquainted with trades (*e.g.* Electricians, Armourers, &c.) which are required in H.M. Ships, and arrangements are now being made for men holding such qualifications to undergo a short training to obtain a certificate of competency in these trades. Those holding such certificates will be available for employment, when called upon, in their trades, and will constitute a valuable Reserve for the Navy.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT.

Northern Estates.—Farms.

Owing to a succession of dry seasons considerable difficulty has been experienced in connection with the water supply on the Scremerston Estate, and, in a lesser degree, at Alston.

New sources of supply have now been rendered available, and, with a small additional expenditure next year, it is not anticipated the difficulty will recur.

All the farms are let.

The purchase of the remaining portion of the Priorsdale Estate (containing about 295 acres) for 7,000*l.* (including timber and farm buildings) was completed in August last. The acquisition of this estate, with the reservoir which serves the Greenwich Hospital Mines, the marketable timber, mineral rights, and sheltered land for wintering stock (of which the adjoining Greenwich Hospital Farms were much in need), should, in every respect, prove to be an advantageous investment.

Greenwich Estate.

Considerable improvements have been effected in the Market and its approaches with a view to rendering them better adapted for the increasing wholesale trade, and further reproductive expenditure will shortly be proposed in order to bring the scheme to completion. The opportunity having occurred of acquiring certain property adjoining the Market which would furnish much needed additional accommodation, it was secured on reasonable terms, and there is every reason to expect it will prove a useful addition to the estate.

APPENDIX I.

The surrender of the short remaining term of the lease of the Market Tolls having been secured by purchase from the lessee, the management of the market and the collection of the Tolls have been assumed by the Department.

Further progress has been made in bringing property generally into a better state of repair, and also in modernising the better class of shop property. The benefit of these improvements is being felt in the letting of premises formerly unoccupied and in the higher rents now obtained.

Royal Hospital School, Greenwich.

The standard of efficiency has been maintained and the highest possible educational grant again earned.

Painted Hall.

The work of cleaning and renovating the interior of the Painted Hall and rehanging the pictures has been completed.

A fine collection of Nelson Relics, consisting chiefly of silver plate, has been presented by Dr. Thomas Corbett, of Droitwich.

A miniature portrait and a gold snuff-box—relics of the late Admiral Sir Thomas Louis—have also been presented.

Investments.

The following changes in Investments have been made during the year :—

Loans Repaid.

50,000*l*. by the Corporation of Leeds.

100,000*l*. advanced on the security of estates in Northumberland.

20,000*l*. by the Local Board of Health, Burslem.

Loans Advanced and Renewed.

Loan of 82,000*l*. on the security of freehold estates in Warwick, and Worcester renewed for seven years. Rate of interest increased from 3⅛ to 3¾ per cent.

Loan of 121,146*l*. 8s. on the security of freehold estates in Glamorganshire renewed for four years. Rate of interest increased from 3½ to 3¾ per cent.

Loan of 145,000*l*. on the mortgage of freehold estates in Lancashire renewed or four years. Rate of interest increased from 3½ to 3¾ per cent.

The renewal of these three Loans resulted in an increase of Income to the amount of 1,178*l*. a year.

Loan of 60,000*l*. advanced on the security of the Hunstrete and Nylands estates in Somersetshire for a period of twelve years. Rate of interest 3⅝ per cent.

Further loan of 60,000*l*. to the Urban District Council of Merthyr Tydvil for a period of fifty years. To be repaid in half-yearly instalments of principal and interest combined. Rate of interest 4 per cent. Only 30,000*l*. has been advanced to date ; the remainder will be paid early in the year.

APPENDIX I

ORDNANCE.

The amount asked for under Vote 9 for 1906–7 is the same as in 1905–6.

Provision has been made to complete the guns laid down for the vessels included in the 1904–5 programme, and for the *Dreadnought*, and to advance the guns for the other ships laid down in 1905–6.

The progress in manufacture and supply of guns during 1905–6 has been satisfactory. As regards the ships building and completing by private firms, the system of placing the guns on board the ships at their works instead of at the Dockyards has been carried out successfully. Following upon the policy of disposing of the older ships, large numbers of obsolete guns and carriages have also been disposed of during the year, and the space thus set free used to store modern armaments. Similarly, large quantities of ammunition have become obsolete for naval purposes, and have either been disposed of or handed over to the War Office. Storage accommodation has thus become available for modern explosives, and congestion has been further relieved by ships in Commission in Reserve keeping their ammunition on board.

Regulations have been promulgated governing the examination of explosives on board H.M. Ships, consequent on the shorter terms of commission which have been introduced.

Considerable improvements have been effected in the designs of recent B.L. guns, and steel of greater tensile strength and higher tenacity has been introduced both for new guns and for the repair of the older patterns.

The supply of the new pattern armour-piercing shell recently introduced has become general throughout the Fleet, and the difficulties of manufacture have been almost entirely overcome.

Improvements in new mountings have been effected principally in the direction of reducing the time required for loading by a more extensive use of power-worked appliances. Experiments are in progress with a view to improving the appliances for training and elevating guns. Designs of electrically operated mountings for heavy guns have also been worked out, and mountings to two different designs will be tried.

The improvements in sights are continuing on the lines of increased accuracy. A large number of new sights have already been supplied to sea-going ships.

Instructional Armaments.

Revised armaments, including instructional appliances for the new Gunnery Schools at Chatham and Devonport, the drill batteries at R.N. Barracks, Chatham, Portsmouth. and Devonport, and the R.M. Batteries, are ready for supply, and instructional appliances for teaching shooting and loading have been supplied to a number of sea-going ships. The Drill batteries are being enlarged to meet the requirements of the new scheme of Gunnery training, the success of which was showed by the result of the Gunlayers' Test in 1905.

Target Practice.

Revised regulations for Gunlayers' Test and Light Q.F. Gunlayers' Test, and for Battle Practice for both Ships and Torpedo Boat Destroyers were issued to the Fleet early last year, and the returns show a satisfactory improvement in the shooting. The practice for the present year will be continued on the same general lines, with such minor modifications as experience has shown to be desirable.

APPENDIX I.

The appointment of an Inspector of Target Practice made early last year has proved successful, and the visits of this officer to the various Fleets has exercised a beneficial effect without in any way lessening the responsibility of the various Commanders-in-Chief and Captains of ships.

The supply of the necessary instruments for enabling fire to be opened with accuracy at long ranges was begun during last year and is now well advanced, a considerable number of ships having been already fitted. Provision has been made in the Estimates for continuing this work, the extreme importance of which is well shown by the returns of Battle Practice carried out in 1905.

New Torpedo School.

A new Torpedo School for Chatham–Sheerness has been established in H.M.S. *Actæon* at Sheerness.

Firing Guns by Electricity.

The whole question of firing guns by dynamo power has recently been settled, and with this system missfires should be in the future considerably less than with the primary cell arrangement formerly in general use.

Ordnance Depots.

In accordance with the general scheme for reorganisation of Naval Establishments at Home, the Naval Ordnance Depots at Chatham, Portsmouth and Plymouth have, from 1st January 1906, been placed under the Admirals Superintendent of the respective Dockyards instead of the Commanders-in-Chief.

It has been found possible to reduce the staff at the Naval Ordnance Depot at Malta without decreasing efficiency, and further reduction will be made if practicable.

The staff employed on Naval Ordnance duties at Gibraltar has been increased to cope with the additional work caused by the Atlantic Fleet being based on that Port. Further increases will probably be necessary as the new buildings, &c., which are being provided are taken into use.

Additional magazine accommodation is being provided at Lodge Hill (Chatham), and additional accommodation for filled shell at Bull Point (Plymouth).

COALING OF THE FLEET.

Further progress has been made in the introduction of craft and plant specially fitted for the rapid coaling of the Fleet.

The experiments for coaling H.M. Ships at sea are being continued.

The Reserves of Coal and Patent Fuel on Foreign Stations have been revised where necessary in the light of the recent reorganisation of the Fleet.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Between 1st April 1905 and 31st March 1906 the following ships will have been completed and become available for service :—

3 Battleships :—*Dominion, Hindustan, New Zealand.*

8 Armoured Cruisers :—*Antrim, Argyll, Carnarvon, Devonshire, Hampshire, Roxburgh, Black Prince, Duke of Edinburgh.*

1 Second Class Cruiser :—*Encounter.*

8 Scouts :—*Adventure, Attentive, Forward, Foresight, Pathfinder, Patrol, Sentinel, Skirmisher.*

16 Destroyers.

13 Submarines.

1 Floating Coal Depot.

On 1st April 1906 there will be under construction :—

6 Battleships.
10 Armoured Cruisers.
12 Destroyers (coastal).
5 ,, (ocean-going).
1 Destroyer (very fast ocean-going).
1 Royal Yacht.
15 Submarines and a Repair Ship.

It is proposed to begin during the financial year 1906–7 :

4 Armoured Vessels.
5 Destroyers (ocean-going).
12 ,, (coastal).
12 Submarines.

Battleships.

The Committee on Designs mentioned in last year's Statement considered the various designs and settled the type of Battleship to be laid down during the financial year 1905–6. This Battleship, *Dreadnought*, is being supplied with turbine machinery on the Parsons system, and was laid down at Portsmouth on the 2nd October 1905, and launched on the 10th February by His Majesty the King. It is hoped that the ship will be put into commission in the beginning of 1907.

The *Lord Nelson* and *Agamemnon* of the 1904–5 Programme, which are now under construction on the Tyne and Clyde respectively, have made considerable progress during the year, and it is expected that they will be completed by their contract dates.

The decision to rearrange the armament in the *Warrior* class has somewhat delayed their completion.

Armoured Cruisers.

The six Armoured Cruisers of the *Devonshire* class have passed successfully through their trials, and all of them are in commission. They attained an average speed of over 23 knots, and one reached 23·6 knots. They are practically identical in speed and coal endurance with the Cruisers of the *Monmouth* class, but are superior in armament and protection.

The *Duke of Edinburgh* has successfully passed through all her trials, and attained a speed of 22·84 knots in rough water and a strong wind on the measured course at Polperro. She has been completed at Pembroke and was commissioned with a nucleus crew on 20th January 1906.

The *Black Prince* has also passed through all her principal trials successfully, attaining a speed of 23·65 knots in fine weather on the Polperro course.

The four later ships of the *Duke of Edinburgh* class which have an auxiliary armament of 7·5″ instead of 6″ guns have all been launched during 1905–06.

The three Armoured Cruisers of the *Minotaur* class which were laid down during January and February of 1905 have made good progress.

During the current financial year contracts have been entered into for the construction of three Armoured Cruisers named *Invincible*, *Inflexible*, *Indomitable*. These vessels are to be ready for commission in May 1908, *i.e.*, within thirty months from the date of ordering.

Scouts.

All the eight vessels of the new *Scout* class have been satisfactorily completed and put into commission. These vessels have fulfilled all the conditions of the designs, and have obtained speeds for six and a half hours' continuous steaming, varying from 25·06 knots to 25·88 knots. The eight vessels have been built from four different designs.

Destroyers.

All the vessels of the *River* class which were under construction at the commencement of the current financial year have been completed and put into commission, making in all thirty-four vessels of this class now in service.

The strength and sea-going capabilities of this class have been severely tested, and have proved very satisfactory.

The twelve coastal Destroyers and the five ocean-going Destroyers included in the current year's Programme have all been ordered. The former will have a trial speed of 26 knots and the latter of 33 knots. Negotiations in connection with ordering one special ocean-going Destroyer of 36 knots' trial speed are nearly complete.

The whole of the Destroyers included in this year's Programme will have turbine machinery and be fitted for carrying and burning oil fuel.

Other Vessels.

The design of a new Yacht for His Majesty has been completed, and the actual building is in hand on the Clyde.

The Steamship *Indrabarah*, now named *Cyclops*, has been purchased for conversion into a Fleet Repair Ship.

Submarines.

The eleven boats in the present year's Programme have been ordered.

General.

Improved appliances for cooking, as well as bread bakeries, are being introduced into ships.

Improved sanitary, ventilating, warming and washing arrangements are also being introduced.

The use of electricity for many purposes on board H.M. Ships continues to increase.

MACHINERY AND BOILERS.

The policy of fitting complete installations of water-tube boilers in warships has been continued, large tube boilers of "Babcock and Wilcox" or "Yarrow" type being fitted in Battleships and First Class Cruisers, and boilers of the small tube type being fitted in Scouts and Destroyers.

The conditions adopted last year, under which all Contractors' machinery trials in new ships were to be carried out under service conditions, have been applied to all later ships.

The policy of providing reserve sets of auxiliary machinery, &c., has been continued during the past year by the provision of further auxiliary machinery, &c., typical for various classes of ships, and the stock is now practically complete to date. These reserve parts will enable ships to be supplied with replace auxiliary machinery with the least possible delay.

The provision of an adequate supply of fresh water for ships of H.M. Fleet has been under continued consideration. Additional evaporating and distilling plant has been supplied to each battleship which was below latest standard in this respect when coming in hand for large refit.

All new ships are to be supplied with independent machines for ice-making and for cold storage.

Standardisation.—The extended policy adopted last year of making the main and auxiliary machinery of ships of the same class interchangeable as far as possible has been continued, and this plan is being carried out in all later ships including Destroyers.

Electric Generating Machinery.—In consequence of the extension of the application of electric motors for driving auxiliary machinery and for ship's purposes generally where applicable, larger installations of generating machinery are being fitted in vessels under construction, and those on the more modern vessels are being increased as the ships are taken in hand for large refit.

Turbine Propelling Machinery.—In view of the satisfactory performances of H.M.S. *Amethyst* fitted with turbine propelling machinery, and of a rapidly increasing number of such installations in ships of the mercantile marine, it has been decided to adopt this means of propulsion in all the war vessel provided for during the present year.

As the result of experience it has been decided to replace the set of reciprocating machinery fitted in the *Velox* (turbine-propelled T.B.D.) for use at low speeds, by turbines adapted for cruising powers.

Liquid Fuel.—The experimental oil fuel establishment at Haslar has been completed, and trials with five of the latest types of water-tube boilers, together with instructional work, are in regular progress there.

The oil fuel installations in *Mars* and *Hannibal* are being brought up to date, and, as opportunity affords, oil fuel appliances are being fitted to H.M. Ships *Cæsar*, *Majestic*, *Magnificent*, and *Victorious*. Installations are also in progress for all the later vessels building and completing.

The Torpedo Boat Destroyer *Spiteful*, fitted to burn oil fuel only, is in commission as an instructional vessel for the training of Engine Room Complements in the manipulation of oil-burning appliances.

WORK AT THE DOCKYARDS.

Owing to changes in the organisation of the Fleet, the amount of repairing work in the Dockyards has been substantially reduced. It has in consequence been necessary to discharge a large number of men during the current financial year. With a view to minimising the unavoidable distress, the discharges were restricted as far as possible to the summer months, and ceased in October last. Corresponding reductions have also been made in the various grades of Subordinate Officers and Office Staff.

During the current year further progress has been made in the development of Gibraltar Yard as a base for the Atlantic Fleet. A number of skilled workmen have been sent from England to strengthen the personnel of the Yard, and the work of erecting machinery and working appliances in the various shops has been satisfactorily advanced.

The work of installing electric light and power in the Dockyards and other Naval Establishments is well in hand. A portion of the installation at Pembroke is working, and it is expected that the installations at Portsmouth, Devonport, and Chatham will follow almost at once.

The installations at Gibraltar and the Cape of Good Hope are already running, and that at Malta will be ready in June next.

Opportunity has been taken in connection with this to place the organisation of the Electrical Staff of both Admiralty and Dockyards on a permanent footing.

So far as Yard Machinery is concerned, the Dockyards are now in a satisfactory position, and the replacement of obsolete machines by up-to-date plant has been practically completed. The premium system of paying extra wages for increased output, which is under trial in some of the Engineering Workshops at the Yards, has given satisfactory results.

LARGE REPAIRS.

The following Ships have been or will be completed during the financial year :—

Battleships :—

Jupiter.
Royal Oak.
Illustrious.
Mars.
Vengeance.

Armoured Cruisers :—

Aboukir.
Cressy.
Bacchante.

Protected Cruisers (First Class) :—

Royal Arthur.

Protected Cruisers (Second Class) :—

Arrogant
Cambrian.
Flora.

Protected Cruisers (Third Class) :—

Pioneer.
Pyramus.

Special Service :—

Actæon, late *Ariadne* (old). Fitted as a Torpedo School for Sheerness.

The most important of the refits to be carried out in 1906–7 are :—

Battleships :—

Hannibal.
Royal Sovereign. } Work commenced in 1905–6.
Empress of India. }
Albion.

Armoured Cruiser :—

Bedford.

Protected Cruisers (First Class) :—

Amphitrite. Work commenced in 1905–6.
Andromeda.
Ariadne.
Edgar.
Gibraltar. Work commenced in 1905–6
Hawke.

Protected Cruisers (Second Class) :—

Hyacinth.
Bonaventure.

Sloops :—

Fantome } To fit as Surveying Vessels.
Merlin. }

NEW WORKS.

Works provided in Estimates.

Cape of Good Hope.—The Hospital and Sanatorium will be completed in 1906–7.

Chatham.—The conversion of Nos. 3 and 4 Slips into a Boat Store has been completed. The alterations to railways at the heads of Nos. 5 to 8 Docks will be completed in 1905–6, and the improvement and extension of the Dockyard Water

Supply, the Residence for the Commander-in-Chief, and the conversion of the Melville Hospital into Marine Barracks in 1906–7. It has been decided not to proceed with he Plate and Angle Gas Furnaces and the Chain Testing House.

Deal.—The Reading and Recreation Rooms at the North Barracks have been completed.

Gibraltar.—The Cold Meat Store, carried out by War Department, is practically completed. The Additional Accommodation and Improvements at the Hospital will be finished in 1907–8.

Greenwich.—The Engineering and Chemical Laboratories at the Royal Naval College have been completed.

Hong Kong.—The Additional Hospital Accommodation and the Ropeway for transporting ammunition are practically finished.

Malta.—The Adaptation of War Department property at Vittoriosa for Victualling purposes and re-provision of accommodation, the Rifle Range at Ghain Tuffieha, and the Store for Lubricating Oil are practically finished. The renewal of the Wharf Walls in French Creek, the new buildings at the Hydraulic Dock, and the Torpedo Range will be completed in 1906–7. Progress is being made with the Reservoir at Luca on a reduced scale. It has been decided not to proceed with the new Storehouses at Corradino or to do any further work in connection with the catch for Corradino Tanks.

Pembroke.—The New Ship-building Shop has been completed.

Plymouth.—The improvements of the Married Officers' Quarters at the Royal Marine Barracks have been completed. The improvements and alterations and the Wards for Lunatics and Prisoners at the Royal Naval Hospital will be practically finished in 1905–6. At Devonport Dockyard, the railways, North and South Yards, and the New Buoy House will be completed during next year ; progress is being made with the new Jetty and Railways between Nos. 2 and 3 Slips and the New Machine Shop, South Yard.

Portland.—The three Official Residences, the Store for Lubricating Oil, and the Naval Canteen will be completed 1905–6. The berthing for Torpedo Boat Destroyers will be completed in 1906–7. Progress is being made with the Repairs to the Head of the Breakwater.

Portsmouth.—The New Block for Officer Patients at Haslar Hospital is finished. In the Dockyard the Railway and Pickling Tank at New Ground, the renewal of Sheer Jetty, and the alterations to No. 5 Slip, will be completed in 1905–6. The lengthening of No. 5 Dock will be completed in 1906–7, and progress is being made with the New Steam Factory, which is nearing completion. The reorganisation of the drainage at Eastney Royal Marine Barracks and the adaptation and improvement of buildings at Haslar Hospital will be completed in 1905–06. The accommodation for Naval Cadets at Osborne and for Sub-lieutenants under instruction at Whale Island is approaching completion, and will be finished in 1906–7.

Sheerness.—The extension of the Railway into the Yard has been completed.

Sydney.—The Prison on Garden Island has been completed.

The principal new Works provided for in 1906–7 are :—

Chatham.—Hoo Ness ; river-training works.

Reconstructing side walls of Upnor Entrance.

Greenwich.—Royal Naval College. Renewing portions of roofs of main blocks.

Harwich (*Shotley*).—New Rifle Range.

Plymouth.—Royal Naval Barracks. Widening Drill Shed.

Portsmouth.—New Lock to existing Basins, &c. Improving shipbuilding facilities.

Lengthening No. 15 Dock. Harbour Protection.

Sheerness.—Harbour Protection.

Woolwich.—Additional railway facilities.

PROGRESS UNDER NAVAL WORKS LOAN ACT.

(*a*) *Enclosure and Defence of Harbours.*

Malta Breakwater.—The purchase of foreshores, &c., and certain minor works connected with the scheme have been completed or are well in hand. The main contract, that for St. Elmo and Ricasoli Breakwaters, is being pressed forward, but serious delays have been caused by storms, and it has been found necessary to extend the contract dates for completion. The date for completion of the whole of this contract is now 1st October, 1908.

Gibraltar.—The Commercial Mole is now completed and in use.

Dover.—The South Breakwater has been brought up to water level for a distance of about 1,950 feet.

(*b*) *Adapting Naval Ports to present needs of Fleet.*

Keyham Dockyard Extension.—The three Docks and the Lock are completed. Closed Basin—excavation three-fourths completed. Tidal Basin—completed, and the dam in front of entrance being removed.

Hong Kong Dockyard Extension.—The Tidal Basin and Wharf Walls and the deepening of Basin Areas, approaches to Wharf Walls, &c., are nearing completion. The construction of jetties on War Department Reclamation, and of buildings for the Engineering and Constructive Departments, is being proceeded with. The Dock and contingent works are well advanced.

Colombo Dock.—This Dock, which is being partly paid for by the Admiralty, is in progress under the Colonial Government and is approaching completion.

Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension.—The Breakwater and the walls enclosing the New Basin are in hand. The Reclamation is in progress and the site for the Dock is being excavated.

A scheme for providing houses for officers and men at this Yard has been prepared.

Malta Dockyard Extension.—Progress on the two new Docks being built by contract has not been very satisfactory, serious delays having been occasioned by water at the Head of the Long Dock, &c. The West Dock is nearly completed.

Bermuda Dockyard Extension.—The Work under the main contract for New Breakwater, Wharf Walls, &c., has progressed very slowly, but is now approaching completion.

Gibraltar Dockyard Extension.—Docks 1, 2, and 3 are in use, and the Yard buildings and shops are nearing completion.

APPENDIX I.

Deepening Harbours and Approaches.

Portsmouth.—The Outer and Inner Bars and the Harbour and Approach Channel have been practically completed. The formation of Ships' Berths in Main Channel and Fareham Creek and in Fountain Lake is in progress. In Haslar Creek the Deepening of Approach Channel and Boat Camber and formation of Deep Berth for Floating Dock have been practically completed. Provision is made in Vote 10 1906–7 for working Admiralty plant to be engaged upon the dredging remaining to be carried out.

Haulbowline.—The formation of Torpedo Boat Trots and Battleship Berths is proceeding by contract and will be completed in 1906–7.

Plymouth.—The dredging above Saltash Bridge is practically completed. Dredging in the Hamoaze off the Keyham Extension Works is being carried out by Admiralty plant. Provision for working this plant is made in Vote 10, 1906–7. Certain contract dredging off West Wall, and at lock entrance of Keyham Extension, is in hand and will be completed in 1906–7.

Coaling Facilities and Fuel Storage.

Plymouth.—Property has been acquired for the establishment of a Coaling Depôt. Railway sidings, coal bases, &c., are being carried out by departmental labour. A contract will be let for jetties and dredging.

Portland.—The contract for the extension of the present Coaling Jetty is almost completed. Good progress has been made with the construction of tanks for storage of Oil Fuel.

Malta.—Completed, except for some excavation and roofing now in hand.

Hong Kong.—The Coaling Jetty at Kowloon, with railways and berths, is almost completed. Drawings and particulars for Coal Sheds are being prepared

Gibraltar.—The Coal island is finished and in use.

Buildings, &c.

Sheerness Depot for Torpedo Boat Destroyers.—Good progress has been made with this scheme.

Naval Establishment at Rosyth.—The necessary land has been purchased. Arrangements have been made to obtain a permanent supply of water; the scheme (including new reservoir and mains) is being carried out by the Dunfermline District Committee. A railway line to connect the Naval Establishment with the North British Railway is being constructed by the Railway Company.

The question of the works to be undertaken at Rosyth is under further consideration. It will be unnecessary to make provision for them in Navy Votes at present, as sufficient funds are available under the Works Loan Act or preliminary services for the needs of 1906–7.

"*Britannia*" *Royal Naval College.*—The main College has been completed and is in occupation. Subsidiary works are proceeding and in some cases are approaching completion.

Magazines.—Increased Magazine accommodation is being proceeded with at Chatham and Malta. Schemes are under consideration for providing additional Magazine accommodation at other Establishments.

APPENDIX I.

Coast Guard Stations and Royal Naval Reserve Batteries.—The Coast Guard works already approved are approaching completion.

Torpedo Ranges.—The extension of the Torpedo Range at Horsea Island is practically completed.

Gunnery Schools.

Devonport.—Contracts have been let for the erection of a block of Quarters for men, and for certain buildings for Gunnery instruction. The works have been commenced.

Portsmouth.—The extension of a Gun Drill Battery is nearly completed.

Chatham.—Tenders have been accepted for Ammunition Room and extension of Barrack Courses Shed. The former work has been commenced.

TWEEDMOUTH.

26th February 1906.

APPENDIX II.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Limited Partnerships [H.L.]	*Lord Avebury*	Read 1^{a} 1st March (1251)
Marine Insurance [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Read 1^{a} 26th February (706) Read 2^{a} 1st March (1251)
*Naval Prize [H.L.]	*Lord Loreburn*	Read 1^{a} 1st March (1251)
Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Read 1^{a} 26th February (706) Read 2^{a} 1st March (1253)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Lord Loreburn*	Read 1^{a} 1st March (1251)
Public Health Act (Amendment) [H.L.]	*Lord Hylton*	Read 1^{a} 1st March (1250)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Aged Pensioners	*Mr. Samuel Roberts*	Read 1^{o} 22nd February (528)
Agricultural Holdings	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1^{o} 27th February (1036)
Borough Court (Dublin)	*Mr. Clancy*	Read 1^{o} 27th February (1035)
Coal Mines (Eight Hours)	*Mr. Brunner*	Read 1^{o} 22nd February (525)
Coal Mines Regulation	*Mr. Compton Rickett*	Read 1^{o} 22nd February (526)
Compulsory Weighing and Measurements	*Mr. Barnes*	Read 1^{o} 22nd February (527)
Contempt of Court (Ireland)	*Mr. Nolan*	Read 1^{o} 22nd February (527)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities)	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1° 23rd February (700)
Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment	*Mr. Cairns*	Read 1° 22nd February (524)
Ecclesiastical Disorders	*Mr. Carlile*	Read 1° 22nd February (523)
Education (Provision of Meals)	*Mr. W. T. Wilson*	Read 1° 22nd February (525) Read 2° 2nd March (1390)
Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge)	*Mr. William Johnston*	Read 1° 22nd February (527)
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act (1893) Amendment	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1° 23rd February (699)
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities	*Sir Charles Dilke*	Read 1° 22nd February (528)
Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment	*Mr. Mackarness*	Read 1° 22nd February (525)
Intoxicating Liquors Local Veto (Ireland)	*Mr. William Redmond*	Read 1° 28th February (1151)
Irish Lights Commission	*Mr. Mooney*	Read 1° 22nd February (528)
Jurors' Expenses	*Mr. Lloyd Morgan*	Read 1° 23rd February (699)
Labour Pensions	*Mr. Grove*	Read 1° 28th February (1152)
Land Tenure	*Mr. Agar-Robartes*	Read 1° 22nd February (524)
Land Values (Assessment and Rating)	*Mr. Trevelyan*	Read 1° 22nd February (531)
Land Values Taxation, &c. (Scotland)	*Mr. Sunderland*	Read 1° 22nd February (524)
Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment	*Mr. M'Crae*	Read 1° 26th February (804)
Licensed Premises (Election days) (Closing)	*Mr. Charles Roberts*	Read 1° 28th February (1152)
Licensing (Scotland) Amendment	*Mr. Findlay*	Read 1° 22nd February (530)
Light Dues (Abolition)	*Sir Robert Ropner*	Read 1° 22nd February (524)
Liquid Traffic Local Veto (Scotland)	*Mr. Cameron Corbett*	Read 1° 26th February (805)
Local Authorities (Qualification of Women)	*Mr. Silcock*	Read 1° 22nd February (526)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment	*Mr. Joseph Devlin*	Read 1° 22nd February (526)
Local Government (Scotland)	*Mr. Younger*	Read 1° 22nd February (530)
Local Government (Scotland) (No 2)	*Major Anstruther-Gray*	Read 1° 27th February (1035)
Local Government (Scotland) Act (1889) Amendment	*Major Anstruther-Gray*	Read 1° 22nd February (528) Bill withdrawn 26th February (904)
Marine Works (Ireland)	*Mr. O'Hare*	Read 1° 22nd February (528)
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister	*Mr. Barker*	Read 1° 22nd February (527)
Merchandise Marks	*Sir Howard Vincent*	Read 1° 22nd February (529)
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment	*Mr. Jackson*	Read 1° 22nd February (530)
Metropolitan Police (Dublin)	*Mr. Kennedy*	Read 1° February 22nd (528)
*Notice of Accidents	*Mr. Herbert Samuel*	Read 1° 27th February (1035)
Old Age Pensions	*Mr. J. W. Wilson*	Read 1° 22nd February (527)
Old Age Pensions (No. 2)	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1° 23rd February (700)
Parliamentary Elections (Disqualification Removal)	*Mr. Marnham*	Read 1° 22nd February (527)
Parliamentary Elections (Hours of Poll)	*Mr. Pickersgill*	Read 1° 22nd February (528)
Parliamentary Voters (Registration)	*Mr. Cremer*	Read 1° 2nd March (1454)
Pharmacy	*Mr. Winfrey*	Read 1° 28th February (1151)
Pilotage	*Mr. Howell Davies*	Read 1° 22nd February (526)
Places of Worship (Sites)	*Mr. Perks*	Read 1° 26th February (805)
*Police (Superannuation)	*Mr. Herbert Samuel*	Read 1° 27th February (1036)
Public Trustee and Executor	*Sir Howard Vincent*	Read 1° 22nd February (529)
Pure Beer	*Mr. Courthorpe*	Read 1° 22nd February (525)
Railway Tickets	*Mr. Morton*	Read 1° 2nd March (1454)
Registration of Voters (Ireland)	*Mr. Charles Devlin*	Read 1° 22nd February (526)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Sale of Coke	*Mr. Rose*	Read 1° 26th February (804)
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland)	*Mr. Sloan*	Read 1° 22nd February (530)
Sale of Whisky	*Mr. Archibald Williamson*	Read 1° 28th February (1152)
Small Holdings	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1° 23rd February (699)
Summary Jurisdiction (Children)	*Mr. John Tennant*	Read 1° 28th February (1152)
Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment	*Mr. Herbert Roberts*	Read° 22nd February (531)
Town Tenants (Ireland)	*Mr. McKillop*	Read 1° 22nd February (525)
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes	*Mr. Hudson*	Read 1° 22nd February (524)
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes (No. 2)	*Sir Charles Dilke*	Read 1° 22nd February (529)
Trawlers' Certificates Suspension	*Mr. Weir*	Read 1° 22nd February (530)
Tuberculosis (Animals) Prevention and Compensation	*Mr. Field*	Read 1° 26th February (805)
Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal	*Mr. Charles Schwann*	Read 1° 22nd February (531)
Wages Boards	*Sir Charles Dilke*	Read 1° 22nd February (529) Read 1° 26th February (805)
*Wireless Telegraphy	*Mr. Buxton*	Read 2° 28th February (1210) Committee 1st March (1383)

APPENDIX III.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1906.

List of Rules, Orders, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations,—Copy of Draft Savings Banks (Investment) Regulations, 1906 [50 and 51 Vic., c. 40, s. 4].	19 February	40 days
op Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Urban District Councils of Ballymoney, Coleraine, Limavady, Portadown, Ballymena, and Banbridge, and confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, closing certain Shops within the said Urban Districts [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1906 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days
Agriculture and Technical Instructions (Ireland) Act, 1899,—Copy of Regulations for the appointment of Members of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction in Ireland [62 and 63 Vic., c. 80, s. 28 (2)].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Time Table of Examinations for 1906 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland identifying the Syllabuses of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the purposes of the Rules of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1906 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland prescribing an alternative work in the Middle Grade Pass Programme in French for the year 1906 [40 and 41 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland substituting a work in the Middle Grade Honours Programme in Irish, 1906, for that originally prescribed [40 and 41 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland amending Rule 42 (iv.) I. (6) and Rule 45 of the Rules of 1906 [40 and 41 Vic., c. 66, s. 6].	19 February	40 days

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Shop Hours Act, 1904,– Copies of Orders made by the Councils of the Boroughs of Accrington, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bury, Battersea, Deptford, Greenwich, Halifax, Middlesbrough, Swindon, Wolverhampton, Cardiff, Pontypridd, Stockport, St. Helen's, Shipley, Southwark, Swansea, Camberwell, Barnsley, Newport (Mon.), Darwen, Grimsby, Stafford, Birkenhead, Leicester, and Barrow-in-Furness, and of the Counties of Lancaster and Monmouth, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	19 February	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Rochdale, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for Barbers' and Butchers' Shops within the Borough ; by the Council of the Borough of Oldham, fixing the hours of closing for Shops in which the trade or business of a Barber, Hairdresser, Boot and Shoe Dealer, or Tailor is carried on ; and by the Council of the Borough of Salford fixing the hours of closing for all Shops at which the trade or business of a Boot Retailer is carried on [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	19 February	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries),—Copy of Regulations, dated 12th December, 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the process of sorting, willeying, washing, combing, and carding wool, goats' hair, and camel hair, and processes incidental thereto [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 84].	19 February	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries),—Copy of Regulations, dated 17th October 1905, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, in respect of the process of spinning by self-acting mules [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 84].	19 February	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Homework),—Copy of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 15th August, 1905, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)]	19 February	40 days
Board of Education,—Copy of Draft Order in Council continuing certain provisions contained in the Order in Council of 6th March 1902 [62 and 63 Vic., c. 33, s. 5].	19 February	4 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford), Copy of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Merton College, Oxford, on 18th March 1904, amending Statutes III. and IV. of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 49].	19 February	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 11th March 1905, amending the Ordinance regulating the Radcliffe Travelling Fellowships [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50].	19 February	12 weeks

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1887 (Oxford),—Copy of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 23rd November 1904, amending Statute IV. and Schedule B of the Statute of the College [40 and 41] Vic., c. 48, s. 50].	19 February	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Christchurch, Oxford, on 29th June 1905, altering Statutes XI., XVI., and XVIII. of the Statutes of the House [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 49].	19 February	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of New College, Oxford, on 21st June 1905, in lieu of Statutes IV. and XIV. of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50].	19 February	12 weeks
Prisons (Scotland),—Copy of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the Appointment of a Visiting Committee to the Prison at Glasgow (Duke Street) [40 and 41 Vic., c. 53, s. 58].	19 February	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Secretary for Scotland, providing for the Early Closing of certain Shops in the Burghs of Paisley, Motherwell, Dundee, Clydebank, Govan, Glasgow, Kinning Park, and Partick [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	19 February	40 days
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance),—Copy of University Court Ordinance No. XI. (Edinburgh, No. 4) Institution of Degrees in Veterinary Medicine and Surgery and relative Regulations) [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20].	19 February	12 weeks
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance),—Copy of University Court Ordinance No. XII.)Edinburgh, No. 5) (Inclusion of Geography among the subjects qualifying for Graduation in Arts) [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20].	19 February	12 weeks
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance),—Copy of Ordinance of the University Courts of the Universities of St. Andrew's, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh (General, No. 1) (Regulations for Degrees in Arts, Supplementary to Ordinance No. 11 (General, No. 6) of the Universities Commissioners) [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20].	19 February	12 weeks
Union of Benefices Act (St. Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor, and Saint Benet Fink),—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of Saint Michael, Cornhill, with Saint Peter le Poor and Saint Benet Fink [23 and 24 Vic., c. 142, s. 15].	19 February	Two months
Union of Benefices Act (St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse),—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of St. Mary, Charterhouse, and St. Thomas, Charterhouse [23 and 24 Vic., c. 142, s. 15].	19 February	Two months

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c.—*continued.*

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Council of the City and County of Kingston-upon-Hull and the Town Council of the Borough of Eccles fixing the Time of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops; by the Council of the County of Chester, fixing the time of Closing for Barbers' Shops in the Urban Districts of Hazel Grove and Bramhall, and Lower Bebington; and by the Council of the Urban District of Swinton and Pendlebury, fixing the Time of Closing for Hairdressers' Shops [4 Edw. VII. c. 31 s. 3 (3)].	20 February	40 days
Military Manœuvres, 1906,—Copy of Draft Order in Council relative to Military Manœuvres, 1906 [60 and 61 Vic., c. 43, s. 1].	21 February	30 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the City of Wakefield, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Hairdressers' and Barbers' Shops within the City [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3, (3)].	23 February	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Southport, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain Classes of Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	26 February	40 days
Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and Amending Acts,—Copy of Scheme for the Management of the Crewkerne Grammar School Foundation, in the parish of Crewkerne, in the county of Somerset, founded by John Combe in or about the year 1499, regulated by a Scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts on 21st July 1876, as altered by Schemes of the Charity Commissioners of 30th November 1877 and 23rd February, 1883, and as amended by a Scheme made under the said Acts on 3rd October 1895 [36 and 37 Vic., c. 87, s. 15].	27 February	Two months
Prisons (Scotland),—Copy of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland with respect to the term of office of a Visiting Committee and the holding of the first meeting of a Visiting Committee [40 and 41 Vic., c. 53, s. 58].	2 March	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

FEBRUARY 13—*MARCH* 2.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen
- University – Ordinances of Court Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 135.

Aberdeenshire
- Parliamentary Election—Eastern Division
  - New Writ, *Feb. 21*, 313.
  - New Member sworn, *Mar. 1*, 1325.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
- Ballykinley Farm, Sale of – Case of J. J. Greene, *Feb. 26* 798.
- Mitchelstown
  - Labourers' Cottages, Rent of, *Feb. 26*, 798.
  - Re-instatements on Countess of Kingston's estate, *Feb. 26*, 768.

Accrington District Gas and Water Board Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Acland, Mr. F. D. [Yorks, Richmond]
- Administration of Ireland—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 146,147.
- Agricultural Districts, Depopulation of, *Feb. 19*, 147.
- Education—Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 147.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 145.
- Trade Disputes Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 148.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*cont.*
- Transvaal—Self-Government for, proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 146.
- Workmen's Compensation Acts, Amendment of, *Feb. 19*, 148.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]
- Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 871.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 871.

Acton Urban District Council
- Dust Destructor, Site for Erection of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 26*, 770.

Admiralty
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
- *Financial Secretary*—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
- Contracts – Specifications, alterations in, Use of British Materials, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. E. Cecil, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 22*, 497.
- First Sea Lord, Attacks on Policy of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Bellairs, *Mar. 1*, 1347-1349, 1351; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1361.

Afflicted Children Bill
- Circular issued to local authorities, result of.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1275.

Africa, Central
British Protectorate—Annual Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.
Game Preservation in.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1297, 1298.
Labour for South African Mines, Recruitment of.
Q. Earl Percy; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282.

Africa, East
Anglo-German Boundary Commission, Increase in Vote for.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Feb. 27*, 1069; Sir E. Grey, 1069.
British Protectorate
Administration—Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 118.
Annual Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.
Appeal Court Seal, Order in Council as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 85, 133.
Report on working of Uganda Railway and Lake Victoria Steamboat Service, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 117.
Game Preservation in.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1297, 1298.
Land Grants, Tabling Return as to.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1297.

Africa, South
(*For particular Colonies, see their names.*)
British Indians, Position of and Proposals as to.
Qs. Col. Legge, Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1125, 1126.
Coal, Imported British, Import Duty on.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282, 1283.
Expenditure—Imperial Contributions.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
Garrison in—Cost, Colonial Contribution, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 491.
Policy of the Government,
Davies, Col. W. T. F., Attack by, at Imperial Light Horse Annual Dinner.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1015.
Qs. Mr. B. Roberts; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1124, 1125.
Definition of.
Os. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 706–721; Earl Roberts, 915, 916; Lord Stanmore, 953.

Africa South—*cont.*
Selborne, Lord, Salary of.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
Settlement of
Boers, Attitude of.
Os. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 709; Viscount Halifax, *Feb. 27*, 922, 923; Earl of Crewe, 995.
Selborne, Earl of, Work of.
O. Viscount Halifax, *Feb. 27*, 923 924.
Unionist Government, Policy in.
O. Mr. Paul, *Feb. 19*, 201, 202.

Aged Pensioners Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.

Agricultural Districts
Depopulation of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 23.
Os. Lord Herschell, 34; Marquess of Lansdowne, 46; Marquess of Ripon, 58; Mr. Acland, 147; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 163; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 177.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 27*, 1036.

Agricultural Rates Act
Grants, Basis for Calculating.
Q. Lord Helmsley; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 28*, 1131.

Agriculture
Fruit and Hop Growers, Protection of, from Foreign Competition, proposed.
Os. Mr. Courthope, *Feb. 28*, 899 900.
Grants for Education and Research—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 73, 112.
Ireland—Statistics Presented, *Feb. 27*, 905, 1005.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Right Hon. Earl Carrington.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Appointment of Members of Council of Agriculture, etc.—Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 126.
Byrne, Mr. M. J., Reason for Non-employment of, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 799, 800.
Inquiry into working of, Proposals as to, Representations from Local Bodies, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Hara; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1274.

[*cont.*

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*
Plunkett, Sir H.
Subscription to Mr. F. Bernard's Presentation, Political Significance of.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1271.
Tenure and Conditions of Office.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 21,* 352–355.
Porter, Mr., Salary, Duties and Qualifications of.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. T. W. Russell ; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 21,* 351, 352.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27,* 1014.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyle]
Crinan Canal, Report on Condition of, proposed, *Feb. 22,* 489.

Alcohol
Industrial use of—Legislative proposals.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26,* 776.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Africa, South—Policy of the Government, Attack on by Col. W. T. F. Davies, *Feb. 27,* 1015.
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1428–1431.
Poor Law Relief, Cost of Maintaining Aged Poor by, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1011.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Algeria
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Aliens
Immigrant Arrivals, Reason for Delay in Publishing List of.
Q. Mr. Levy ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26,* 769, 770.
Prisoners, Measuring and Photographing — Regulations Presented, *Feb. 23,* 621 ; *Feb. 26,* 704.
Rejections in British Ports in 1906.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Mar. 1,* 1295.

Aliens Act, 1905
Chinese Immigrants, Application to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28,* 1149.
Excess Expenditure, Information as to.
Os. Mr. L. Jones, *Feb. 28,* 1209, 1210 ; Mr. Gladstone, 1210.

Aliens Act, 1905—*cont.*
Immigration Boards, Press Admission to Proceedings of.
Q. Mr. S. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1025, 1026.
Political Refugees Case of Alexander Onix.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Crooks, Sir W. Evans-Gordan ; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 26,* 778, 779.
Scottish Procedure—Act of Adjournal, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 89, 136.
Working of.
Os. Mr. Crooks, *Feb. 26,* 858–861.

Althorp, Viscount—*Lord Chamberlain*
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13,* 3.

Anglo-Foreign Relations
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 21.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, 26.

Angola
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1436–1440.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
Firth of Forth, prohibition of illegal trawling in, *Feb. 26,* 790.

Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26.* 701.

Ardrahan
Outrage on Mr. and Mrs. F. Shawe-Taylor, alleged public approval of men arrested, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1266.

Argentine Republic
Agreements with Chile, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 77, 119.
Quebracho and Cotton in the Chaco—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 70.

Argyle
Motor Car traffic, order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 89, 135.

Armagh
Urban District Council, refusal to grant site for Monument, occasion for employment of extra police, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27,* 1031.

Armagheur
Grazing farm, disposal of.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1270, 1271.

Army

Secretary of State—Right Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.

Appropriation Account and Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 122.

Arsenals and Factories, re-employment of men discharged from.
Q. Colonel Legge; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1286.

Clothing Contracts, information as to.
Qs. Mr. Nicholls; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 27*, 1016

Courts Martial, Press admission to trial of Staff Sergeant-Major Hilton.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 494

Defaulters' Sheet, system of making entries upon, Remarks of H.R.H., Duke of Connaught, etc.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 490.

Firing practice, annoyance caused by, at Plymouth, etc.
Q. Mr. Dobson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1286.

Grenfell, Lord—Tenure of appointment as General commanding in chief the forces in Ireland.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 333, 334.

Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis epidemic, compensation for officers' horses destroyed during.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1287, 1288.

Manœuvres—Draft Order in Council Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333; *Feb. 22*, 455.

Norwich Cavalry Barracks, decision as to.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 26*, 773.

Officers—Tailors employed by candidates, Rule as to selection of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 1013, 1014.

Ordnance, Allocation of contracts to private firms.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 28*, 1116.

Ordnance Factories
Annual Accounts Presented, *Mar. 1*, 1259.
Appropriation Account, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 122.

Pay, Exceptions—List Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 138.

Pimlico Clothing Factory—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 20*, 209.

Prisons—Report (1904) Presented, *Feb. 19*, 72, 112.

Army—*cont.*

Promotions—Majors, proposals as to seconding, etc.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1287.

Recruiting, Decrease in Ireland in 1905, Reason for.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 491.

Regimental Marches through agricultural districts, effects of.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1298.

Report of Director of Recruiting and Organisation, Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333, *Feb. 22*, 455.

Royal Hibernian Military School—Religious qualification of sergeant instructor.
Q. Mr. Macneill; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 334, 335.

Savings Bank—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 26*, 705, 761.

Soldiers in Civil prisons, number, nature of offences, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 27*, 1018.

Training—Col. Pollock's Scheme, Army Council Attitude towards.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 490.

Works—Approximate Estimate of Expenditure under Acts of 1897, 1899, 1901, and 1903, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 112.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
Army—Norwich Cavalry Barracks, decision as to, *Feb. 26*, 773.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb 20*, 230.
Navy—Officers, new Scheme of Training for, *Mar. 1*, 1361–1365.
Questions, Imputations against Members in, *Feb. 28*, 1143.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 231–234.
Self-Government for, Question of, *Feb. 20*, 234, 235; *Feb. 28*, 1124.

Arran Island
Motor Car Traffic, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 135.

Art, Royal College of
Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 112.
Report Presented, *Feb. 27*, 905, 1005.

Ascot District Gas Electric Lighting Bill
c. 1r.* *Feb.* 21, 317.

ton, Mr. T. G. [Beds., Luton]
Exchequer Bonds drawn for payment, delay in publishing Numbers of, *Feb 26*, 777.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]

Alcohol, Industrial use of—Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 26*, 776.

Business of the House, Course of, *Feb. 28*, 1150; *Mar. 1*, 1324.

Canals—Proposals as to Royal Commission, *Feb. 27*, 1034; *Mar. 1*, 1324.

Chinese Immigration, Prevention of, *Feb. 28*, 1149.

Colonies—Diplomatic Representation in Foreign Courts, *Feb. 26*, 802.

Customs and Excise

Confiscated Goods, Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 1296.

Food and Drink, Taxation of—Revision of system, Proposed, *Feb. 26*, 763.

Ecclesiastical Disorders Royal Commission Report, Date of issue of, *Feb. 27*, 1034.

Exchequer Bonds—Delay in publishing numbers of Bonds drawn for payment, *Feb. 26*, 777.

Fiscal Policy, Postponement of Debate on, *Feb. 28*, 1150.

Guiana, British—Repatriation of Coolies, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Income Tax Collection—Scottish procedure, *Feb. 22*, 506.

King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 667, 681.

Closuring Debate on, *Feb. 26*, 806.

Navy Estimates—Motion to Report Progress, *Mar. 1*, 1381.

Old Age Pensions

Colonial System, circulating Information as to, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 776.

Scheme, Estimated cost of, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Sum required to provide 5s. per week for Persons over sixty-five in United Kingdom, *Feb. 26*, 775.

Plural Voting Bill—Clause to deal with several Candidates standing for same Constituency proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 801; *Feb. 27*, 1034, 1035; *Feb. 28*, 1152–1154.

Questions, Order of—Questions left unanswered at three o'clock, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1325.

Roads, Maintenance of, out of Imperial Funds, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 903.

Street Traffic Commission Report, Proposals as to Adoption of Recommendations of, *Feb. 26*, 802.

Tea Duty—Budget Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1323.

Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland—Extension of Time for Rebate, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1146.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*

Transvaal

Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 667, 670, 672, 673.

White Labour, Effect of Stoppage of Chinese Labour on, *Mar. 1*, 1323.

University Colleges, Grants to, *Feb. 26*, 776.

Wines, Basis, Proposals as to taxing, *Feb. 28*, 1147.

Assam

Bengal, Partition of, *see under* India.

"Assistance"

Court Martial—Procedure in conveying Minute to Officers and Press, Report made to Admiralty by Captain, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 22*, 496, 497.

Atkinson, Lord

Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Attorney-General—*Sir J. Lawson Walton*

Attorney-General for Ireland—*Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry*

Australia

Home Rule Resolution *see under* Ireland.

Austria-Hungary

Inland Navigable Waterways—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.

Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

Avebury, Lord

Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1254.

Axholme Joint Railway (Hatfield Moor Extension Light Railway)

Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 114.

Bacup Corporation Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 317.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Bahamas

Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Baker, Sir J. [Portsmouth]

Naval Dockyard Employees, Grievances as to Wages, Conditions of Employment, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1372, 1373.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 317.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, N., Chorley]

International Exhibitions, Contributions to, *Feb. 27*, 1055, 1056.

Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1055.

Transvaal—Sum allocated for Repatriation of Chinese Coolies, *Feb. 23*, 623.

Ballacolla

Post Office on Licensed Premises, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26*, 800, 801.

Ballinacurra
Sewer Works, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27,* 1033.

Ballinderreen
Kearney, Mr., Attack on House of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27,* 1032.

Ballinrobe
Constabulary—Period of Service of Mr. T. Lowndes.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Bryce. *Mar. 2,* 1389.

Ballykinley Farm
Sale of—Reinstatement of J. J. Greene, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 798.

Bangor (County Down)
Local Government Board, Order Presented, *Feb. 19,* 90, 125.

Bank of England
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 20,* 205, 210.
Notes, Regulations as to cashing of, by Joint Stock Banks.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 26,* 777.
Return as to amount of Notes issued, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 93, 120.

Bankruptcy Courts
Ireland—Annual Returns, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 1386.

Bann River
Drainage—Report Presented, *Feb. 28,* 1114; *Mar. 1,* 1250.

Bantry Bay
Steam Trawling, Restrictions on.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1.* 1273.

Barbados
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 68, 116.

Barhane
Padden, J., Case of—Necessity for Police Protection, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 764.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 868.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 867.

Barnes, Mr. J. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Housing of the Working Classes Act, Application of, to Scotland, *Mar. 1,* 1320.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20,* 259.

Barnes, Mr. J. N.—*cont.*
Old Age Pensions, Urgency of the Question, *Feb. 20,* 261–265.
Poor Law Relief, Persons in Receipt of, *Mar. 1,* 1313.
Postage, free, for Members of Parliament, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 1310.
Workmen's Compensation Acts, Amendment of, *Feb. 20,* 259, 260.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Cross—Damage to Property of Mr. R. Bailey, *Feb. 22,* 516.
Poor Law—Irish Commission Report, Date of Issue of, *Mar. 2,* 1388.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork County, S.]
Cork County South, Reinstatements effected in, *Feb. 26,* 797.
Ikerrin, Lord, Appointment of, as Inspector of Irish Produce sent to England, *Feb. 21,* 349, 350.

Barry Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Basutoland
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69, 117.

Bath Electric Tramways (Light Railway Extension
Order Presented, *Feb. 19,* 71, 114.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Militia—Training Proposals, *Mar. 1,* 1289.
Natal Disturbances—Use of Imperial Troops, *Mar. 1,* 1288.
Orange River Colony,
Population, Statistics as to, *Feb. 27,* 1021.
Self-government Proposals—Conditions of Franchise, *Feb. 27,* 1021.
Sugar, Beet—Prices (1903–6), *Mar. 1,* 1292.
Transvaal Population, Statistics as to, *Feb. 27,* 1021.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 872.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 872.
Militia—Field Service Dress—Reason for Non-supply of Caps, *Feb. 21,* 335.

Bechuanaland Protectorate
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69. 117.

Beckett, Mr. G. [York, N.R., Whitby]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 869.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 869.
Pilots, Alien, Legislative Proposals as to, *Mar. 1,* 1306.

Beet Sugar
see Sugar—Beet.

Belfast
Parliamentary Election Campaign.
Os. Mr. C. Craig, *Feb. 21*, 408–410.
Queen's College
Endowment, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Long, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1*, 1316, 1317.
Report (1904–5) Presented, *Feb. 19*, 72, 111.

Belgium
Antwerp—Scheme for Extension of Port, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.
Inland Navigable Waterways—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Railway Servants, Accidents to—Coupling, etc., and use of shunting poles, *Feb. 26*, 784.
Trades Disputes Bill, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1305.
Truck Acts, Amendments of, Hardships involved by present system, etc., *Feb.* 27, 1084, 1098.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis.]
Navy
Armaments, Possibility of effecting a reduction in, *Mar. 1*, 1345.
"Assistance" Court-martial —Procedure in conveying Minute to Officers and Press, etc., *Feb. 22*, 496.
"Britannia" and "Dreadnought," men employed in building, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1006.
Cawdor's, Lord, Memorandum of 30th November, 1905, Decision as to, *Feb. 22*, 495.
Officers, proposals as to training of, *Mar. 1*, 1344–1351.
Policy—Reports quoted in Statement of 30th November, *Mar. 1*, 1299.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 614.
Members of Parliament, Free postage for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1311.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour question, *Feb. 22*, 614.
Labour, native, employment of Kaffirs, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1019.

Bengal
See under India.

Benn, Mr. J. W. [Devonport.]
Naval Dockyards—Distribution of work between private and Government dockyards, *Mar.* 1, 1358–1360.

Bere, Alston and Calstock Light Railway
Amended Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 113.

Berkshire
Charities—Return Presented, *Feb. 19*, 139.

Bethnal Green Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb 26*, 701.

Bideford, Clovelly and Hartland Light Railways
Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 455, 488.

Bills
Ballot for introduction—Sessional Order, *Feb. 20*, 217.
House of Lords
Date of introduction into, inadequate time for discussion, etc.,
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Feb. 19*, 46; Marquess of Ripon, 59.
Policy with regard to controversial measures sent from the Commons.
O. Duke of Devonshire, *Feb. 22*, 461.
Partly considered, carrying over to the next session, Proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 28*, 1121, 1122.
Private Bills
Rules for Referees, Presented, *Feb. 28*, 1114.
Standing Order No. 92, Suspension of, *Feb. 19*, 96.
Railway—Report Ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114 Presented, *Mar. 2*, 1386.
Unopposed Bill Committees, Nomination of Members, *Mar. 1*, 1325.

Birkenhead
Polling districts, Order altering, Pesented, *Feb. 19*, 88, 127.

Birmingham, Bishop of
Introduced to House of Lords, *Feb. 19*, 24.

Birrell Right Hon. A.—*President, Board of Education.* [Bristol, N.]
East Ham—Overcrowding in Kensington Avenue School, alleged, *Mar. 1*, 1319.
Education Act Amendment Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 140; *Feb. 28*, 1133.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1440–1443.
Grant—Period for payment of, *Feb. 22*, 510.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 587.
Non-provided Schools—Return, Information given in, *Feb. 28*, 1134.
Science, College of, and School of Mines—Decision as to Committee Report, *Feb. 26*, 789.
Training Colleges
Admission, etc., Revision of Regulations, for *Feb. 28*, 1119.
University Training, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1318.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 587–593.
Voluntary School Premises, Tenure and Trusts of—Return proposed, *Feb. 22*, 493.
Welsh Subjects, Decision as to, *Mar. 1*, 1318.

Births
Scotland—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.

Blake Estate
Rent Recovery Proceedings at Brackloonbeg.
Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1140.

Blind Persons
Postage on Literature for
Q. Lord Valentia; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1311, 1312.

Bohemia
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry S.]
Clooghvoola—Decision as to Road to Cahersavane, *Feb. 27*, 1029.
Consular Reports, Alteration in Form of, proposed, *Feb. 27*, 1068.
Fisheries—Close Season Enquiries, Procedure in Holding, *Feb. 28*, 1136, 1137.
School Building Plans, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1028.

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway (Purchase) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Bond Investment Companies
Report on, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 116.

Borough Court (Dublin) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 27*, 1035.

Boston
Blythe, H. and C., Imprisonment of, for Non-maintenance of Parents—Poor Law Guardians as Magistrates, etc.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27*, 1026.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Education—Religious Teaching in State Schools, *Feb. 20*, 295, 296.
Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 20*, 298.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 293.
Members of Parliament, Free Postage for proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1311.
Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1064.
Old Age Pensions, Question of, *Feb. 20*, 296, 297.
Sum required to Provide 5s. per week for Persons over Sixty-five in United Kingdom, *Feb. 26*, 775.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 294, 295.
Repatriation Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1284.
Trials—Use of Chinese Language, etc., *Feb. 26*, 772.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Hunts, Ramsey]
Magistracy, County—Operation of Resolution of 5th May 1893, *Feb. 22*, 520.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1431–1435.

Bradford
Child Feeding Order
Cost of Meals, etc.
Q. Mr. Jowett; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 28*, 1132.
Prosecutions, Verdict given by Judge Bompas, etc.
Q. Mr. Jowett; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1129.

Bramble Island, Essex
Explosion at—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 72, 108.

Brazil
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Brewers' Licences
See under Liquor Traffic.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
East Ham—Overcrowded State of Kensington Avenue School, alleged, *Mar.* 1, 1319.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 614.

[*cont.*

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C.—*cont.*
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 614–620.
Compounds, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1020.
Pless, Mr., proposed criminal proceedings against—Date of Despatch of Telegram, etc. *Feb. 23*, 623; *Mar. 1*, 1278.
Parliamentary Elections, Date of, *Feb. 27*, 1020.

Bridgewater Canals Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorks, W.R., Keighley]
House of Commons—Enlargement of Post Office in Lobby proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1312.
Trade Reports—English Equivalents to Foreign Weights and Measures, *Mar. 1*, 1304.

Bristol Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 317.

"Britannia," H.M.S.
Men employed in Building, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1006.

British Guiana
See Guiana, British

British Honduras
See Honduras, British

British Museum
Accounts, Return and Statement, ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

British South Africa Company
Financial Statement, etc., Presented, *Feb. 28*, 1114; *Mar. 1*, 1249.

Brittas
Rent Appeal Case of Mrs. Morin, Decision in.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1138, 1144

Brixham Gas [Electric Lighting] Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 317.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Chinese Immigration to United Kingdom, Prevention of, *Feb. 28*, 1149.

Brotherton, Mr. E. A. [Wakefield]
Orange River Colony Constitution, Date of bringing into force, *Feb. 28*, 1125.
Transvaal—Chinese Coolies, Repatriation of—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1123.

Brunei
Order in Council presented, *Feb. 19*, 85–133.

Brunner, Mr. J. F. L. [Lancashire, S.W. Leigh]
Nigeria—Children, Reason for alleged Sale of—Price of Salt, etc., *Feb. 22*, 497.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Aberdeen, S.]
Administration — Policy, Necessity for Changes in, *Feb. 21*, 418–425.
Afflicted Children Bill—Result of Circular issued to local Authorities, *Mar. 1*, 1275.
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.
Byrne, Mr. M. J., Reason for Non-Employment of, *Feb. 26*, 800.
Inquiry, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1274.
Plunkett, Sir H.
Political Significance of Subscription to Mr. Bernard's presentation, *Mar. 1*, 1271.
Tenure of Office by, *Feb. 21*, 353.
Porter, Mr., Salary, etc., of, *Feb. 21*, 351, 352; *Feb. 27*, 1014.
Ardrahan — Outrage on Mr. and Mrs. F. Shawe Taylor, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1266.
Armagh Urban District Council, Refusal to grant Site for Monument, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1031.
Armagheur Grazing Farm, Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 1271.
Army Officers—Tailors employed by Candidates, *Feb. 27*, 1014.
Ballinacurra Sewer Works, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1033.
Ballinderreen—Attack on Mr. Kearney's House, *Feb. 27*, 1032.
Ballykinley Farm, Sale of—Case of J. J. Greene, *Feb. 26*, 798.
Bantry Bay, Restrictions on Trawling in, *Mar. 1*, 1273.
Barhane—Case of J. Padden, *Feb. 26*, 764
Blake Estate Rent Recovery Proceedings. *Feb. 28*, 1140.
Brittas—Rent Appeal Case of Mrs. Morrin, *Feb. 28*, 1138, 1144.
Cahirciveen District Council, etc., Appointments, Political Restrictions on Candidates, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1264.
Carrickmore—Removal of Dungannon Club placards by Police, *Feb. 27*, 1030.
Cavan Land Commission Judgments, Delay in giving, *Feb. 21*, 356.
Cawnmore—Disturbance at house of J. Madden, *Mar. 1*, 1263.
Clare Land Commission Sittings, Date of *Feb. 27*, 1029.
Clifden Harbour Works, Delay in commencing, *Feb. 26*, 765.
Clonkeen Eviction, Police services at, *Feb. 22*. 518.

[*cont.*

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B.—*cont.*
  Post Office in Western District, Messenger's overtime pay in, *Mar. 1,* 1312.
  Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1194, 1195.
  Supply, Alteration in Procedure as to, *Feb. 28,* 1195.
  Transvaal, Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20,* 223–226.

Burghclere, Lord
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27,* 908–914.
  Transvaal, and Orange River Colony—Grant of Self-government to, *Feb. 27,* 906-909, 914.

Burma
  Telegraph Service—Junction of Chinese and Burmese lines, Revised Convention Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 118.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
  Acton—Site for Erection of Dust Destructor, *Feb. 26,* 770.
  Agricultural Rates Act Grants, Basis for calculating, *Feb. 28,* 1131.
  Children, Underfed—Bradford Child-feeding Order, Poor Law Guardians Administration of, *Feb. 28,* 1132.
  Coasts, Erosion of *Feb. 26,* 875.
  County Councils, Compulsory Hiring Orders issued by, *Mar. 2,* 1388.
  Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1446.
  Feeble-minded Commission, Appointments to, *Feb. 27,* 1054.
  Housing of the Working Classes Acts, Administration of. *Feb. 27,* 1027.
  Industries of the Country, Satisfactory Condition of, *Feb. 26,* 887, 896.
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 875.
  Labour Bureaux, Working of—Publication of Inspector's Report, etc *Mar. 1,* 1313.
  London (Equalisation of Rates) Act (1894) Amendment Bill, scope of, etc., *Feb. 20,* 217; *Feb. 27,* 1011.
  Meat, Boneless—Regulations as to Inspection of Imports, *Feb. 20,* 213.
  Militia, Winter training for, *Feb. 26,* 895.
  Motor Car Commission, date of Presenting Report, *Feb. 27,* 1038.
  Poor Law
    Medical Officers, Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 1387.
    Relief
      Cost of maintaining Aged Poor by, *Feb. 27,* 1011.
      Persons in receipt of, *Feb. 26*; 889; *Mar. 1,* 1314.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Redistribution Commission, work and Constitution of, *Feb. 27,* 1038, 1046–1048, 1051; *Feb. 28,* 1200, 1201.
    Confidential Nature of Report, *Feb. 26,* 788.
  Thames, Pollution of Estuary by Sewage, Proposals for Prevention of, *Feb. 22,* 509.
  Tuberculosis in Animals
    Bovine Tuberculosis Commission Report, date of Presenting, *Feb. 20,* 214.
    Compulsory Slaughter, Compensation for, *Feb. 20,* 213.
  Unemployed
    Number of—Statistics, *Feb. 26,* 887, 893.
    Relief works, Farm Colonies, etc., Attitude of Local Government Board towards, *Feb. 26,* 890–895, 898.
    Return as to, *Feb. 26,* 887.
    Wages, Rate of, *Feb. 26,* 890.
  Vagrants, Increase in Number of, *Feb. 26,* 888.
  Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill, 2R., *Feb. 27,* 1111.

Burry Port Gas and Improvement Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 317.
    2R.* *Feb. 27,* 1004.

Bury Corporation Bill
  l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Business of the House
  Course of.
    Cs. Mr. S. Evans, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 22,* 522, 523; Mr. Asquith *Feb. 28,* 1150; Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1,* 1324.

Bute
  Motor Car Traffic, Order as to, Presented. *Feb. 19,* 89, 135.

Butter
  Ireland
    Ikerrin, Lord, Appointment of, as Inspector of Irish produce sent to England.
      Qs. Mr. E. Barry, Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21,* 349, 350.
      Q. W. Mr. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22,* 513.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Cleator Moor District Facilities, Improvement of, *Feb. 27,* 1028.
  Grievances of Employees, Inquiry into
    Proposals as to, *Feb. 20,* 216; *Feb. 22,* 492; *Feb. 26,* 787.
    Witnesses, Selection of, *Mar. 1,* 1293.

[*cont.*

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
- Hammersmith—Postal District of Margravine Road, *Mar. 1*, 1260.
- House of Commons—Post Office in Lobby, Enlargement of, proposed, *Mar.1*, 1312.
- Ireland
  - Ballacolla—Post Office on Licensed Premises, *Feb. 26*, 801.
  - Collinstown Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Feb. 26*, 771.
  - Drumlish postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Feb. 26*, 787.
  - Dungarvan District Facilities—Motor Service proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1295.
  - Granard and Cloonagh Evening Postal Collection, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 358.
  - Limerick—Inspector of Postmen—Alleged delay in filling Vacancy, *Feb. 22*, 518.
  - Longford—Hours of Business, *Feb. 21*, 358.
  - North of Ireland Service to England, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 358, 359.
  - Wexford—Charge for Private Bags, *Mar. 1*, 1322.
- Parcels Post—Weight, Maximum, Increase in, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1131.
- Postage
  - Blind Persons, Literature for, *Mar.*, 1312.
  - Members of Parliament, free Postage for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1310, 1311.
  - Periodical Literature, Rates for *Mar. 1*, 1260, 1261.
- Postmen, Pay of, at Withington, *Mar. 1*, 1313.
- Telegraph Service
  - Keadue, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1323.
  - Rotherhithe — Dockhead Telegram Delivery, *Mar. 1* 1387.
- Telephone Service
  - Central Telephone Exchange, Complaints as to working of, *Mar. 1*, 1261.
  - London Message Rate Subscription, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1261.
  - National Telephone Company Employees, Position of—Legislative Proposals, etc., *Feb. 26*, 786, 787.
- Wages
  - Bradford Commission Recommendations, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 787.
  - Inquiry proposed, *see subheading* Grievances of Employees.
- Western District Office, Messengers' Overtime pay in, *Mar. 1*, 1312.
- Wireless Telegraphy Bill 2R., *Feb. 28*, 1210, 1211; *Com.*, *Mar. 1*, 1383.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
- Africa, South—Native Races, Protection of, under the new Constitution, *Feb. 28*, 1212–1214.
- King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 690.
- Redistribution Committee, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1040.
- Tea Duty—Budget Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1323.
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 690.

Cahirciveen District Council, etc.
- Appointments—Powers of Local Authorities to Introduce Political Restrictions, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1263, 1264.

Cairns, Earl
- Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Brother, *Feb. 19*, 24.

Cairns, Mr. T. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
- Trade, British, Compilation of Statistics as to, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1309.

Cambrian Railways Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Camoys, Lord
- Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir. H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
- Administration of Ireland—Devolution proposals, *Feb. 19*, 175, 176.
- Agricultural Districts, Depopulation of, *Feb. 19*, 177.
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Tenure of Office by Sir H. Plunkett, *Feb. 21*, 355.
- Bills, Partly considered—Carrying over to the next Session, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1122.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Feb. 22*, 522, 523.
- Crimes (Ireland) Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 19*, 176.
- Divisions, Amendment of System of Taking, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 519.
- Ecclesiastical Disorders—Royal Commission—Date of issuing Report, *Feb. 22*, 519.
- Education—Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 177; *Feb. 22*, 523.
- Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 19*, 174, 178, 179.
  - Discussion of, Opportunity for, *Feb. 22*, 521.
- Food Supply in Time of War—National Indemnity Committee, Proposals as to, *Feb. 21*, 335.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon., Sir H.—*cont.*
Foreign Office Questions, Proposals as to answering, Rule as to Supplementary Questions, etc., *Feb. 21*, 340, 341; *Feb. 22*, 504.
King's Speech
Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 164; *Feb. 20*, 307; *Feb. 21*, 371; *Feb. 23*, 644, 689.
Adjournment of the House, *Feb. 20*, 307.
Proceedings on, to have Precedence, *Feb. 21*, 359.
Ladies' Gallery in House of Commons—Removal of Grille proposed, *Feb. 22*, 520, 521.
Liquor Licensing—Omission of Legislative Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 174.
Magistrates, County—Operation of Resolution of 5th May, 1893, *Feb. 22*, 520.
Members of Parliament—Payment of, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 773.
Morocco—Conference of European Powers, *Feb. 19*, 166.
National Gallery Directorship Vacancy, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1295.
Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 21*, 371.
Parliamentary Election—Expenses, etc., Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 520; *Feb. 26*, 773.
Parliaments, British and Foreign—Periods of Meeting, *Feb. 27*, 1017.
Post Office Wages Inquiry—Terms of Reference of Select Committee, *Feb. 21*, 359.
Public Accounts Committee Reports, Opportunity for discussing, *Mar. 1*, 1299.
Speaker, Election of, *Feb. 13*, 10, 11.
Swedish Magnetic Iron Ore, proposed Export Duty on, *Feb. 21*, 339.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 170–174; *Feb. 23*, 644, 645, 689, 690, 691.
Self-Government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 167–170.
Unemployed—Distress Committees, Treasury Grant to, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 490.

Canada
British Commercial Representative, Official Appointment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 502.
Cattle importation into United Kingdom, Despatch Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 117.

Canals
For Particular Canals see their names.
Bills—Report Ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Canals—*cont.*
Commission of Inquiry.
Scope of.
Q. Mr. C. Edwards; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 27*, 1034.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1*, 1324.
Welsh Representation.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28*, 1130.
Continental inland navigable waterways—Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.

Cancer Research (Colonies)
Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 117.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1254.

Cape Colony
Franchise regulations for white and coloured persons.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1019.
Kimberley Mines, Condition of Kaffirs employed in.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1121.
Naval Hospital at Cape Town, Date of completion of, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1*, 1376; Mr. Lambert, 1377.
Population of.
Os. Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, *1*, 1019, 1020.

Cardiff Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 318.

Cardiff Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Carlisle Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 318.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Rotherhithe—Dockhead Telegraph Office arrangements, *Mar. 2*, 1387.

Carrickmacross
Local Government Board Order, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 125.

Carrickmore
Dungannon Club placards, Removal of, by Police.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1030.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
Westbury Division of Wilts, Objections to issue of New Writ for, *Feb. 19*, 101.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]
Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 21*, 400.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb 21*, 400.
Land Purchase Grants, Proposals as to, *Feb. 27*, 1034.

Cathcart, Earl
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Cattle
Epizootic Abortion, Result of Inquiry into. *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 27*, 1028–1029.
Importation, Restrictions on
Effect on prices of meat.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 27*, 1008–1110.
Proposals as to removal of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Mar. 1*, 1314.

Cavan
Land Commission Judgments, Delay in giving.
Q. Mr. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 355, 356.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 318.

Cawnmore
Madden, J. Disturbance at house of, Police efforts to trace offenders, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1263.

Cawsand Bay
Gunboat practice, Annoyance caused by. *Q.* Mr. Dobson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1286.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1450–1452.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 583.
Medical and Dental Acts, Proposals as to amending, *Feb. 28*, 1129.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 583–586.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
Admiralty Contracts—Proposals as to alteration in Specifications, *Feb. 22*, 497.
Guiana, British—Tabling Amendments to Indian Labour Ordinance, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 502.

Central Essex Light Railway
Amended Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 113.

Ceylon
Education, Elementary, Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 502, 503.

Chairman
Deputy, Alteration in *status* of, proposed. *O.* Mr. L. Hardy, *Feb. 28*, 1174.
Matter revelant to Discussion, *Feb. 27*, 1065, 1066, 1068, 1069.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, W.]
Administration of Ireland—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 161, 162; *Feb. 21*, 439–444.
Agricultural Districts, Depopulation of *Feb. 19*. 163.
Business of the House, Course of, *Feb. 22*, 522, 523.
Crimes (Ireland) Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 19*, 162.
Education—Legislative proposals, *Feb. 19*, 163.
Fiscal Policy, Changes in, *Feb. 19*, 164.
Foreign Office Questions, answering, during Absence of Secretary, *Feb. 22*, 504.
Home Rule—Devolution Proposals, etc., *Feb. 21*, 439–444.
India—Visit of Prince and Princess of Wales to, *Feb. 19*, 152, 153.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 149; *Feb. 21*, 367; *Feb. 23*, 678, 686.
Closuring Debate on, *Feb. 26*, 805.
Liquor Licencing Question, *Feb. 19*, 160.
Macedonian Administrative Reforms, Progress made with, *Feb. 19*, 153.
Morocco—Conference of European Powers, *Feb. 19*, 153.
Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 21*, 368.
Post Office Wages Inquiry—Terms of Reference of Select Committee, *Feb. 21*, 359.
Trade, alleged Prosperous Condition of, *Feb. 19*, 159, 160.
Trade Disputes, Exclusion of Foreign contract labour proposed, *Feb. 26*, 861.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 155–159; *Feb. 23*, 678, 681, 682, 686, 687, 688, 689, 691, 692.
Self-Government, Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 154, 155.
Westbury Division of Wilts., Objection to Issue of New Writ for, *Feb. 19*, 97–100.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
Alcohol for Industrial purposes, Legislative Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 776.
Business of the House—Course of, *Mar. 1*, 1324.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
- Fiscal Policy, Postponement of Debate on, *Feb. 28*, 1149, 1151.
- Grand Committees—Granting power of Closure to Chairman, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1173.
- International Exhibitions, Contributions to *Feb. 27*, 1058–1061; *Feb. 28*, 1208, 1209.
- Members of Parliament, free postage for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1311.
- Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1059.
- Navy
  - Hospital at Cape Town, Date of completion of, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1376.
  - Surgeons, Decisions as to Post-Graduate Courses for, *Mar. 1*, 1377.
- Navy Estimates—Motion to Report progress, *Mar. 1*, 1378–1381.
- Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1155–1156, 1173, 1193.
- Redistribution Committee, Work and Constitution of, *Feb. 27*, 1042–1045; *Feb. 28*, 1201.
- University Colleges, Grants to, *Feb. 26*, 776, 777.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
- *Right Hon. Sir H. Fowler.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer
- *Right Hon. H. H. Asquith.*

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
- Parliamentary Elections—Inquiry into Expenses, etc., proposed, *Feb. 22*, 519.

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 318.

Charities
- Berkshire—Return Presented, *Feb. 19*, 139.
- Stafford—Report as to Charities Appropriated to Elementary Education purposes, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 113.

Chelsea
- Polling Districts, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 88, 128.

Chelsea Hospital
- Army Prize Money and Legacy Funds—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 121.

Cheltenham Gas Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 318.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R. [Liverpool, Exchange]
- Granard Estate Turbary Rights, *Feb. 26*, 793.
- Legal Notices, Regulations as to Advertisement of, *Feb. 26*, 769.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*cont.*
- Sligo Conspiracy Trials
  - Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 356, 357.
  - Jury-packing at, Alleged, *Mar. 1* 1321 1322.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
- *Right Hon. J. Bryce.*

Children
- Cigarettes, etc., Legislative Proposals for restricting Sale of.
  - *Q.* Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27*, 1023.
- Employment of, out of School Hours—Report on Bye-laws of London County Council, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 110.
- Insurance, Legislative Proposals for restricting.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 22*, 506.
- Reports on Children under Five Years of Age in Public Elementary Schools, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 112.
- Underfed, in Schools
  - Child-feeding Order, Prosecutions under—Verdict of Judge Bompas at Bradford, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Jowett; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1129.
  - Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, *see that title.*
  - Interdepartmental Committee Report, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 113.

Chile
- Agreements with Argentine Republic Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 119.

China
- Honan, Land Taxation in—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.
- Kiangsi, Report in Journey on, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.
- Telegraph Service—Junction of Chinese and Burmese Lines, Revised Convention as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 118.
- Trade Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Chiozza-Money, Mr. L. G. [Paddington, N.]
- Factory Inspectors, Examination Subjects for, *Feb. 27*, 1024.
- Flax Industry, Effect of American Linen Duties on, *Feb. 26*, 783.
- International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1064.
- Religious and Philanthropic Institutions, Inspector of Industrial Establishments of, *Feb. 28*, 1126.
- Russian New Customs Tariff, Effect of, *Feb. 26*, 781.

Church Temporalities (Ireland)
- Accounts and Report Presented, *Feb. 26*, 704, 763.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N. W.]
- Africa, Central
  - Game Preservation in, *Mar. 1*, 1278.
  - Labour Recruitment for Transvaal, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
- Africa East
  - Game Preservation in, *Mar. 1*, 1298.
  - Land Grants, Tabling Return as to, *Mar. 1*, 1297.
- Africa, South
  - British Indians, Position of and Proposals as to, *Feb. 28*, 1126.
  - Coal, Imported British, Duty on, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
  - Expenditure—Imperial Contributions, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
  - Native Races, Protection of, *Feb. 28*, 1231–1244.
  - Policy of the Government—Attack by Col. W. T. F. Davies, *Feb. 27*, 1015; *Feb. 28*, 1124, 1125.
  - Selborne, Lord, Salary of, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
- Australian Parliamentary Resolutions as to Irish Home Rule, *Feb. 27*, 1018.
- Canada—British Commercial Representative official, Appointment of, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 502.
- Cape Colony
  - Franchise Regulations, statistics as to Population, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1019, 1020.
  - Kimberley Mines, Condition of Kaffirs employed in, *Feb. 28*, 1121.
- Ceylon—Education, Elementary, Proposals for dealing with, *Feb. 22*, 503.
- Colonies, Self-Governing—Occasions of exercise of right of Veto, *Feb. 28*, 1115.
- Guiana, British
  - Demerara, cause of Disturbances in, *Mar. 1*, 1279.
  - Indian Labour Ordinance, Tabling Amendments to, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 502.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 554; *Feb. 23*, 632, 640, 646, 686, 688.
- Natal
  - Disturbances—damage done to native crops, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1021.
  - Martial Law, Date of Establishing, *Feb. 21*, 339.
  - Poll-tax, Information as to, *Feb. 21*, 339.
- Nigeria
  - Children, reason for Alleged Sale of, *Feb. 22*, 498.
  - Punitive Expeditions, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1280.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Nigeria—*cont.*
  - Rising near Sokoto, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1022.
  - Salt, Price of, etc., *Feb. 22*, 498.
- Orange River Colony
  - Constitution
    - Date of bringing into force, *Feb. 28*, 1125.
    - Franchise, Conditions of, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
  - Population, Statistics as to, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
- Somaliland, Game Preservation in, *Mar. 1*, 1298.
- South African War, Compensation claim of General Botha, *Mar. 1*, 1285.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 535, 549, 554–572, 578, 617, 618; *Feb. 23*, 632, 640, 646, 686.
    - Arrivals of Coolies, Information as to, *Feb. 22*, 499.
    - Compounds, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
    - Corporal Punishment
      - "Cangue," use of, *Feb. 28*, 1116.
      - Head collars and stocks, Alleged use of, *Feb. 22*, 500.
      - Milner's, Lord, Attitude towards, *Feb. 22*, 500; *Feb. 28*, 1116.
      - Violation of Regulations, Allegations as to, *Mar. 1*, 1281.
    - Importation, Decision as to, *Mar. 1*, 1283.
    - Letter to Earl of Selborne, dated 5th January, Reply to, *Mar. 1*, 1285.
    - Lyttelton's, Mr., Telegram of 27th Oct., Effect of, *Mar. 1*, 1286.
    - Ordinance—Amendment, Proposals as to, *Feb. 28*, 1115; *Mar. 1*, 1281.
    - Pless, Mr., proposed Criminal Proceedings against—Date of Despatch of Telegram, etc., *Feb. 23*, 624; *Mar. 1*, 1279.
    - Re-enlistment of Coolies, Proposals as to, Amendment of Clause, etc., *Feb. 22*, 498.
    - Regulations, revised, Tabling, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 499.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
  Transvaal—*cont.*
    Chinese Labour—*cont.*
      Repatriation Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1284.
        Correspondence, Tabling, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1123.
        Incidence of Payment of cost of, *Feb. 22*, 501.
        Notice required for obtaining leave, *Feb. 27*, 1020.
        Sum allocated for, etc., *Feb. 23*, 623.
      Trials—Use of Chinese Language, etc., *Feb. 26*, 772.
    Garrison, Decision as to retaining, *Feb. 28*, 1117.
    Indian Coolie Labour, Conditions of, *Feb. 28*, 1126.
    Labour Recruitment in British Central Africa, *Mar.* 1, 1282.
    Mines—Gold Output, *Feb. 27*, 1022.
    Native Labour
      Kaffir Compounds, Proposals for improving, *Feb. 28*, 1121.
      Statistics as to, *Feb. 27*, 1019.
    Parliamentary Elections, Date of, *Feb. 27*, 1020.
    Population, Statistics as to, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
    Self-Government
      Papers showing Local demand, Publication of, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
      Volunteer Forces, Power of raising, *Feb. 28*, 1124, 1125.
    War Contribution Loan—Payment, Proposals as to enforcing, *Feb. 21*, 338; *Feb. 22*, 501.
    White Labour, Condition of, *Mar. 1*, 1283, 1284.
  Uganda, Game preservation in, *Mar. 1*, 1298.

City of London Electric Lighting Bill
  c. 1r.* *Feb. 21*, 318.

Civil Contingencies Fund
  Accounts (1904–5) ordered, *Feb. 20*, 212; Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333.

Civil Service
  Appointments without Certificates, *Feb. 19*, 92, 123.
  Appropriation Accounts, *Feb. 19*, 123.
  India, *see that title.*
  Superannuation—Allowances, etc., granted, *Feb. 19*, 92, 124; *Feb. 26*, 705, 761.

Civil Service Estimates
  Milan Exhibition—£10,000, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1054; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1199.
  Newfoundland Fisheries Indemnity—£54, 683, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1069; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1200.
  Presented, *Mar. 2*, 1385.
  Samoa Arbitration Claims—£8,567, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1075; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1200.
  Supplementary.
    Customs—£9,000, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1065; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1199.
    Diplomatic and Consular Services—£500, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1068; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1199.
    Friendly Societies Registry—£130, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1036; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1199.
    Land Commission, Ireland—£1,600, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1065; *Rep.* Feb. 28*, 1199.
    Presented, *Feb. 19*, 120.
    Temporary Commissions—£36,000, *Com., Feb. 27*, 1037; *Feb. 28*, 1199.
      Amount Required for—Estimate Presented, *Feb. 22*, 488.
  Vote on Account—Estimate Presented, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Clacton Urban District Council Bill
  l. 1r.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin County, N.]
  Development Grant Fund Accounts, Report on, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1120.
  Dublin
    Leech, Mr. P., Case of, Evidence of Police Sergeant, etc., *Feb. 26*, 767.
    Phœnix Park—Grounds Allotted to Football, *Feb. 28*, 1146.
  Land Purchase Regulations—Statement by Mr. Long, proposed, *Feb. 27*, 1066.
  Rathmines and Rathgar—Provision of Mortuary for, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 772.
  Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 26*, 788; *Feb. 27*, 1038, 1046.

Clare
  Land Commission Sitting, Date of.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1029.

Clarke, Sir E. G. [City of London]
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 593; *Feb. 23*, 664.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 593–595; *Feb. 23*, 664.
  Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1101.

Cleator Moor
Postal Facilities in District, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Fullerton; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 27*, 1028.

Clifden
Harbour Improvements, Delay in Effecting.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 765.

Clonkeen
Eviction, Police Force at, Cost and Incidence of Charge for Services, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 517, 518.

Clooghvoola
Road to Cahersavane, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1029.

Cloonagh
Postal Collection, Evening, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 21*, 358.

Coal
Africa, South—Import Duty on British Coal.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282, 1283.

Coal Mines
Explosion at—Rhondda Valley (Wattstown)—Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 108.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 525.

Coal Mines Regulation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 526.

Coast
Erosion of, by the Sea.
Os. Mr. S. Wilson, *Feb. 26*, 862–864; Mr. L. White, 864; Mr. H. H. Marks, 866; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 871; Mr. H. Beaumont, 872; Mr. Lloyd-George, 873–875; Mr. A. Douglas, 875; Mr. McVeigh, 876.

Area of Land Destroyed.
Os. Mr. S. Wilson, *Feb. 26*, 863; Mr. Summerbell, 872.

Defence Works, Erection of.
Os. Mr. H. J. Tennant, *Feb. 26*, 870, 871; Mr. H. Beaumont, 872; Mr. Summerbell, 873.

Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Wilson, *Feb. 26*, 863, 864; Mr. L. White, 865; Mr. G. Baring, 868; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 872; Mr. Lloyd-George, 874; Mr. A. Douglas, 875, Mr. Burns, 875; Mr. McVeigh, 876.

Coast—*cont.*
Erosion of, by the Sea—*cont.*

Local Authorities, Expenditure Entailed on.
Os. Mr. L. White, *Feb. 26*, 865; Mr. H. H. Marks, 867; Mr. G. Baring, 868; Mr. Beckett, 869, 870.

Collings, Mr. S. [Lambeth, Kennington]
Lambeth Hairdressers' Trade, Application of Early Closing Order to, *Feb. 26*, 780.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1404–1409.

Science, Royal College of, and School of Mines—Decision as to Committee Report, *Feb. 26*, 788.

Collinstown
Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26*, 770, 771.

Colonial Conference
Organisation of Future Conferences—Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 117.

Postponement of—References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 23.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. Churchill

Colonies
Cancer Research—Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 117.

Foreign Courts, accredited Diplomatic Representation in.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 802.

Legislatures—Periods of sitting, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 27*, 1016 1017.

Reports
Annual Series, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 116, 117.

Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69, 117.

Self-Governing—Veto, occasion of exercising right of, by Home Government.
Q. Colonel Legge; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1115.

Commerce
See Trade and Commerce.

Committees
Appeal, Appointment of, *Feb. 19*, 66.

Chairmen, Nomination of, *Feb. 27*, 1112.

[*cont.*

Committees—*cont.*
  Grand Committees
    Delegation of work to, alleged failure of the Experiment.
      Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 28*, 1161, 1162; Mr. L. Hardy, 1171, 1172; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1177; Sir F. Powell, 1189; Sir H. Fowler, 1191, 1192.
    Procedure—Granting power of closure to Chairmen, etc.
      Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Feb. 28*, 1172-1174; Mr. Speaker, 1173; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1173.
  House of Lords—Appointment of Chairman, *Feb. 19*, 66.
  Journals, Appointment of, *Feb. 19*, 66.
  Police and Sanitary—Appointment, etc.—Resolution (Mr. H. Samuel), *Feb. 26*, 759.
  Privileges, Appointment of, *Feb. 19*, 66, 107.
  Public Petitions Committee—Nomination of Members, *Mar. 1*, 1384.
  Select—Interim Reports, Powers as to Issuing.
    Os. Mr. Pickersgill, *Feb. 28*, 1165; Mr. Speaker, 1165.
  Unopposed Bill Committees—Nomination of Members, *Mar. 1*, 1325.

Compulsory Weighing and Measurement Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 527.

Comyn Kenny Estate
  Purchase of, Reason for delay, etc.
    Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1031.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
  Legal Notices, Regulations as to Advertisement of, *Feb. 26*, 768.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
  Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 111.

Congo Free State
  Administration of
    Commission of Inquiry Report, Date of Issuing.
      O. Earl Percy, *Feb. 21*, 342.
    European Powers, Right of Intervention by, etc.
      Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Feb. 21*, 342.
    Proposals as to.
      W. Evans-Gordon; *A.*
      rey, *Feb. 26*, 774, 775.

      Presented, *Feb. 23*, 621.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
  (*See also names of places.*)
  Control, Proposals as to Transfer of.
    Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 800.
  Enlistments during 1905-6.
    Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1277, 1278.
  Lowndes, Mr. T.—Period of Service in Ballinrobe.
    Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 2*, 1389.
  Masterson and Cryan, Constables, Information as to.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1270.
  Woodville and Kilchreest District extra Police, Reason for and Cost of.
    Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1263.

Contempt of Court (Ireland) Bill
  c. 1R.*, *Feb. 22*, 527.

Conventual and Monastic Institutions
  Laundries in, *see that title.*

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
  Constabulary control, Proposals as to Transfer of, *Feb. 26*, 800.
  Laundries
    Religious Institutions, Inspection of *Feb. 22*, 507.
    Unregulated, Proposals as to Inspection of, *Feb. 26*, 780.
  Parliamentary Election Disturbances in Ireland, Police Efforts to preserve the Peace, etc., *Feb, 28*, 1142.
  Question, Reason for postponing, *Feb. 28*, 1142, 1143.

Corfe Mullen
  Polling Districts, Order as to, Presented *Feb. 19*, 88, 129.

Cork
  Queen's College, Endowment, Proposals as to.
    Qs Mr. Long; *A.* Mr. McKenna *Mar. 1*, 1316, 1317.
  Reinstatements effected in South Cork County.
    Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 797, 798.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 319.

Cork Link Railways Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 319.

Cork and Waterford Railways Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 319.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 92, 120.

Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 23*, 700.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 319.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Costa Rica
Parcels Post—Amended Warrant Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
India.
  Administration of — Extension of Powers of Local Self-government, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 818–822.
  Bengal
    Director of Public Instruction, Procedure in Appointing, *Mar. 1*, 1301, 1302.
    Partition of, Objections to, *Feb. 26*, 822–830.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 818.
Tibet Treaty, Progress of Negotiations, *Feb. 26*, 775; *Mar. 1*, 1304.

County Councils
Compulsory Hiring Orders issued by. *Q.* Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Mar. 2*, 1388.

County Courts
Fees (England) Treasury Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 456, 488.
Stationery, etc., Contracts, Decision as to. *Q.* Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1*, 1317.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
Africa, South—British Indians, Position of and Proposals as to, *Feb. 28*, 1126.
Colonies—Diplomatic Representation in Foreign Courts, *Feb. 26*, 802.
Fruit and Hop Growers, Protection of, from Foreign Competition, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 899, 900.
Hop Crop Returns—Actual instead of Estimated Produce proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1132.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 898.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
Africa, South
  Garrison in—Cost, Colonial Contribution, etc., *Feb. 22*, 491.
  Selborne, Lord, Salary of, Contributions from Imperial funds to South African Civil Expenditure, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1282.
Canals—Commission of Inquiry, Scope of, *Mar. 1*, 1324.
Cape Colony—Franchise Regulations, Statistics as to Population, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1019, 1020.
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1412–1420.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 370.
Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1065.
Natal, Martial Law in, Information as to Poll Tax, etc., *Feb. 21*, 339.
Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 21*, 370; *Mar. 1*, 1299.
Newfoundland Fisheries, Indemnity—Objections to defraying out of Imperial Funds, *Feb. 27*, 1069–1072.

Craig, Capt. J. [Down, E.]
Blake Estate—Rent Recovery Proceedings, *Feb. 28*, 1140.
Killescragh—Disturbance at House of M. Fahey, *Feb. 28*, 1141.
Militia—Training Arrangements for Royal Irish Rifles, *Feb. 28*, 1117.
Monasterboice—Case of J. Elliott, *Feb. 28*, 1141.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Belfast — Parliamentary Election Campaigns, *Feb.* 21, 408–410.
Home Rule Question—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 21*, 411–414.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 408.
Neagh, Lough, Drainage of—Tabling Sir A. Binnie's Report, proposed, *Feb. 23*, 623.
Sligo County Council Printing Contract, Tenders for, *Feb. 28*, 1140.

Craig, Mr. H. J. [Tynemouth]
"Satellite," H.M.S.—Decision as to Retention on the Tyne, *Feb. 27*, 1009.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1399–1404.

Crediton Lighting and Power Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Parliament—House of Commons—Ladies' Gallery—Removal of grille, etc., *Feb. 22,* 520.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by present System, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1106.

Crete
Disturbances in, Settlement of.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 22.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, 50.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council*
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 22,* 481–486.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19,* 63.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19,* 64, 65; *Feb. 27,* 996–1002.
Self-Government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 27,* 994–996, 1003.
Working Classes, Condition of, *Feb.* 22, 482.

Crewkerne
Grammar School Foundation—Scheme Presented, *Feb. 27,* 905, 1005.

Crimes and Outrages, Ireland
See under Ireland.

Criminal Law Procedure
Legislative Proposals for Amending.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir L. Walton, *Mar. 1,* 1291.

Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887
Proclamation Revoking Certain Proclamations, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 94, 127.

Crinan Canal
Condition of—Report proposed.
Q. Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb. 22,* 489.

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Amendment Bill
Introduction of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 24.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Feb. 20,* 268, 269; Mr. Morton, 276.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Aliens Act
Political Refugees—Case of Alexander Onix, etc., *Feb. 26,* 779.
Working of, *Feb. 26,* 858–861.
Education—Training Colleges, Proposals as to University Courses in, *Mar. 1,* 1317, 1318.

Crooks, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1448.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 857.
Old Age Pensions, Opportunity for Discussion of, *Feb. 28,* 1151.
Trade Disputes, Exclusion of Foreign Contract Labour, proposed, *Feb. 26,* 857–861.
Volunteer Uniforms—Responsibility for Contracts, etc., *Feb. 21,* 337.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
Bailey, Mr. R., Damage to Property of, Police Efforts to discover Offenders, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Barrie; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22,* 516.
Houses in Scotland, Letting of, Amendment of Law as to, proposed, *Feb. 20,* 302–305.
Income Tax Collection in Scotland, Date of, *Feb. 22,* 506.
Parliament—House of Commons
Arrangements, Consideration of, proposed, Removal of Sale of Bills Office, etc., *Feb. 22,* 511, 512.
Outer Lobby—Proposals as to decorating Vacant Panels, *Feb. 27,* 1007.

Crossrea
Norris, Mr. and Mrs. John, Case of—Monetary Assistance from Army Funds proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 2,* 1390.

Crown Lands
Information as to, Amount of Land Vacant, etc.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1,* 1315.

Crystal Palace Company Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Cuba
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69; *Feb. 22,* 454.
Treaty of Commerce, etc., with—Despatch Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 119.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Cusack Estate
Sale of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21,* 348.

Customs and Excise
Confiscated Goods, Procedure in Disposing of.
Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 28*, 1118, 1119.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1*, 1295, 1296.
Food and Drink, Revenue derived from Taxes on—Revision of System proposed.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 763.
Foreign New Customs Tariffs, Effect of, on British Trade.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1308, 1309.
Outdoor Department—Promotion of Junior Supervisor.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 26*, 769.
Overtime in Customs Statistical Office, Payment for.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1*, 1315, 1316.
Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1065; *Feb. 28*, 1199.

Cyprus
Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 117.

Dalkey
Disused Tramway—Minute as to Lease of Land, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 92, 123.

Dalmeny, Lord [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
Highland Society's Show, Railway Facilities in connection with, *Feb. 28*, 1133.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1062.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 606.
Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1054.
Motor Car Commission, Date of presenting Report, *Feb. 27*, 1037.
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1167–1170.
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1037, 1040, 1051; *Feb. 28*, 1200.
South African War Stores, Commission of Inquiry into, Date of presenting Report, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1037, 1051.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 606–613.
Repatriation, Incidence of Payment for, *Feb. 22*, 500, 501.
War Contribution Loan Repayment, Proposals as to securing, *Feb. 22*, 501.

Davies, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, N.]
India
Administration of — Extension of Powers of Local Self-government, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 837, 838.
Bengal, Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 837.
Loishilman Proposed Railway, Information as to, *Feb. 26*, 771.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 837.

De la Warr, Earl
Foreign Seamen on British Ships—Inclusion of Legislation as to, in Merchant Shipping Bill, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1256.

Deaths
Scotland
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.

Defence of the Empire
Submarine Mines, Defence of Ports by, Proposals as to System substituted for, etc.
Q. Mr. Ridsdale; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 26*, 774.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
Baggot & Tuckey, Messrs., Term of Office of, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1144.
Ballacolla, Post Office on Licensed Premises at, *Feb. 26*, 800.
Brittas—Rent Appeal Case of Mrs. Morrin, *Feb. 28*, 1138, 1144.
Clonkeen Eviction, Police Services at *Feb. 22*, 517.
Dunne, J., Estate of—Memorial as to Purchase, etc., *Feb. 22*, 517.
Masterson and Cryan, Constables, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1270.

Delvin
Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Application of C. Clinton, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 20*, 215.

Denmark
King Christian IX., Death of.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 21.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, 25; Lord Herschell, 31; Marquess of Lansdowne, 37; Marquess of Ripon, 48; Mr. W. H. Dickenson, *Feb. 19*, 141; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 152.
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Dental Acts
Amendment, Proposals as to.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1129.

Derby Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 319.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 320.

Desborough, Lord
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 14.

Desertmartin
Disturbances at, Protection of District by Police, etc.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1032.

Devlin, Mr. C. R. [Galway]
Galway Granite, Merits of, *Mar. 1*, 1301.
Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1063.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
Condition of Ireland—Responsibility of the British Government for Lack of Progress, etc., *Feb. 21*, 389, 390, 394.
Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 21*, 386.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 385.

Devon South Hams Light Railways
Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 114.

Devonport Light Railway
Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 113.

Devonshire, Duke of
Bills sent to the House of Lords from the Commons, Policy with regard to, *Feb. 22*, 461.
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 22*, 456–466.
Foreign Commerce and Home Industries, Condition of, *Feb. 22*, 456–460.
Unionist Party in the House of Lords, Policy of, *Feb. 22*, 461–466.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
Teachers, Training of—Effect of Provisions of Draft Regulations, *Feb. 26*, 791.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness]
Taxation, Local—Result of Scottish Inquiry, *Feb. 26*, 791.

Dickinson, Mr. W. H. [St. Pancras, N.]
Administration of Ireland—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 144.
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 19*, 142.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 140.
Transvaal—Self-Government Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 144.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]
Parliamentary Procedure, Proposals as to revision of, *Feb. 26*, 801.
Street Traffic Commission Report, Proposals as to Adoption of Recommendations of, *Feb. 26*, 801.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1448–1450.
Match Box Industry—Effect of Order 81, *Feb. 28*, 1129.
Parliamentary Procedure, Proposals as to Revision of, *Feb. 27*, 1035.
Sugar—Brussels Convention, Proposals as to Termination of, *Mar. 1*, 1303.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1076, 1109.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department Inquiry, Nature of Proposals as to, *Feb. 21*, 355.
Education, Condition of, Necessity for Reforms, etc., *Feb. 21*, 436, 437.
Foreign Office Questions, Proposals as to answering, Rule as to Supplementary Questions, etc., *Feb. 21*, 341.
Home Rule Question—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 21*, 433–439.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 370.
Land Act, Necessity for Amendment of, *Feb. 21*, 437.
Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 21*, 370.
Peers, Interference of, at Elections—Case of Lord Atkinson, *Feb. 19*, 103–105.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Reports, *see* Trade Reports.
Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1068; *Feb. 28*, 1199.

Diseases of Animals
See names of Diseases, as Tuberculosis.

Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 524.

Divisions
See under Parliamentary Procedure.

Dobson, Mr. T. W. [Plymouth]
Plymouth and Cawsand, Annoyance caused by firing practice, *Mar. 1*, 1286.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Dodd, Sergeant W. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Devolution, Proposals as to, *Feb. 21*, 394.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 394.

Donemana
Nationalist Assault on Orangemen, alleged, Police Protection of District, etc.
Q. Mr. Liddell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1276, 1277.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Coast, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 875.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 875.
Speaker, Election of, *Feb. 13*, 11.

Dover Corporation Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Dover Harbour Board Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Dowlais Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 320.

"Dreadnought," H.M.S.
Men employed in building, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1006.

Drumlish
Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26*, 787.

Dublin
Leech, Mr. P., Case of, Evidence of Police Sergeant, etc.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 767.
Phœnix Park—Grounds allotted to Football.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 28*, 1146.
Trinity College, *see under* Ireland.
Workhouse in North Dublin—Infantile Mortality Rate.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 517.

Dublin, Wicklow and Wexford Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 320.

Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster
See titles Cornwall *and* Lancaster.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
Woodville and Kilchreest District, extra Police in, *Mar. 1*, 1263.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 266.
Houses in Scotland, Letting of, Amendment of Law as to, proposed, *Feb. 20*, 306.
International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1056, 1064.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 265.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1108.

Dungarvan District
Postal Facilities—Motor Service proposed.
Qs. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1294, 1295.

Dunn, Mr. A. E. [Cornwall, Camborne]
King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 663.
Transvaal.
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 663, 664.
Letter to Earl of Selborne, dated 5th January, Reply to, *Mar. 1*, 1284.
White Labour. Condition of, *Mar. 1*, 1284.

Dunne, J., Estate of
Sale of—Memorial as to Purchase for Redistribution, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 517.

Dunraven Estates
Sale of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lundon; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1137, 1138.

Durham
Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 129.

East Ham
Kensington Avenue School, Overcrowded State of, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Bridgeman; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Mar. 1*, 1319.

East Indies
Netherland—Report as to Finances, Presented *Feb. 22*, 454.

East Sussex Light Railway
Amended Order, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 113.

Ecclesiastical Disorders
Royal Commission Report, Date of issuing.
Q. Mr. A. Taylor; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 519.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 27*, 1034.

Ecclesiastical Disorders Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 22,* 523.

Edinburgh

University.

Finances—Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 93, 134.

Ordinance of Court, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 95, 135.

Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 93, 135.

Education, Board of

President—Right Hon. A. Birrell.

Draft Order in Council, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 84, 132.

Education [England and Wales]

Children under five years of age—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 74, 112.

East Ham—Overcrowded State of Kensington Avenue School, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Bridgeman; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Mar. 1,* 1319.

Evening Schools—List Presented, *Feb. 19,* 75, 113.

Grant, Period for Payment of.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 22,* 509, 510.

Local Authorities — Return Presented, *Feb. 19,* 131.

Non-provided Schools
Return as to tenure of Premises, Character of Trusts etc., ordered, *Feb. 23,* 622.

Information given in.
Q. Mr. Wyndham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 28,* 1133, 1134.

Report to the Board, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 75, 112.

Stafford—Report as to Charities Appropriated to Elementary Education purposes, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 74, 113.

Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19,* 75, 113.

Training Colleges

Admission,etc., Revision of Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 28,* 1119.

University Training, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Mar. 1,* 1317, 1318.

Underfed Children, *see* Children—Underfed.

Voluntary School Premises, Tenure and Trusts of—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 22,* 492, 493.

Welsh subjects, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Mar. 1,* 1318.

Education (England and Wales) Act

Passive Resister's goods, Legality of Police charge for Storing.
Q. Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1025.

Education (England and Wales) Act Amendment Bill

Introduction of

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 24.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19,* 28, 29; Marquess of Lansdowne, 45; Marquess of Ripon, 59; Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 19,* 140; Mr. Acland, 147; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 163; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 177; Mr. K. Hardie 196, 197; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Feb. 20,* 221, 222; Mr. Morton, 275; Mr. Bottomley, 295, 296.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb.* 22, 523.
Q. Mr. Finch; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 28,* 1133.

Education (Ireland)

Commissioners' Report—Appendix, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 79, 110.

Condition of, Necessity for Reforms, etc.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21,* 422; Mr. Dillon, 436, 437.

Grants—Reason for Reduction.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 795.

Intermediate

Examination—Time Table, Rules etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 90, 126.

Grant System, Revision of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 795.

Rules Presented, *Feb. 19,* 90, 125.

Syllabuses of Agriculture, etc., Department, Rule as to, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 90, 126.

National School Teachers' Pensions—Rules Presented, *Feb. 19,* 78, 111.

Rule 127B

Decision as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21,* 352.
Opinions of Managers as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 2,* 1386.

School Building plans, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 27,* 1028.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1,* 1274.

Education (Scotland)
- *Vice-President of the Council*—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
- Secondary—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.
- Teachers, Training of—Draft Regulations Effect of.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb 26*, 791, 792.

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill
- c. 1r.* *Feb. 22*, 525.
- 2r. *Mar. 2*, 1390.
- Debate on Second Reading (Commons), *Mar. 2*, 1390.
  - *Cantine Scolaire* System in Paris, 1425, 1441.
  - Charitable and Local Agencies, Work done by 1398, 1409, 1423–1425, 1428, 1436–1438, 1442.
  - Clause 2, Alteration of, proposed, 1405.
  - Cookery Centres, Utilisation of— London County Council Experiments, 1407.
  - Cost of
    - Rates, Burden on, 1397.
    - Recovery of from Parents, where possible, proposed, 1391, 1396, 1398, 1415, 1416, 1423, 1445.
    - Twelve to fifteen millions per annum, 1400, 1412.
  - "Education," Definition and Scope of, 1401.
  - Inquiry into Cause of Underfeeding, and Condition of Homes, proposed, 1413, 1430.
  - Johanna Street School, Condition of Children in, 1413.
  - Local Education Authorities, Extension of Powers of, proposed, 1394, 1396, 1404, 1405, 1422, 1423, 1431, 1433, 1434, 1441, 1442.
  - Number of Children Habitually Underfed—Statistics, 1395, 1420, 1421, 1444.
  - Parental Responsibility, Objections to Interference with, 1390, 1397, 1412, 1415, 1418, 1420, 1432–1434, 1439.
  - Physical Deterioration Committee, Report and Recommendations of, 1395, 1400, 1407, 1422.
  - Reformatories and Industrial Schools, Work of, 1402, 1403.
  - Scientific and Economic Importance of the Question, 1391–1393, 1398, 1426, 1427, 1429.
  - Select Committee, Referring Bill to, proposed, 1443, 1445–1448.
  - Selection of Children, Difficulties of, 1437, 1438.

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill—*cont.*
- Debate on Second Reading—*cont.*
  - State Control of Children from Infancy, Advantages of, 1401, 1402, 1418–1420.
  - Wages
    - Average Weekly Rate of, 1390, 1391, 1410, 1444.
    - Effect on, Lowering of Rate, alleged, 1417, 1437.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
- Canals—Proposals as to Royal Commission, *Feb. 27*, 1034.

Egypt
- Nile Steamship Company, Alleged Transfer of, to German Firm.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Feb. 27*, 1007.

Electrical Power (Additional) Supply (London) Bill
- c. 1r.* *Feb. 21*, 316.

Electricity Supply Bill
- Report Ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
- Orange River Colony—Self-government, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 747, 748.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 26*, 734–745.
  - Self-government, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 745, 746.

Emigration and Immigration
- Alien Immigrant Arrivals—Reason for Delay in publishing List.
  - *Q.* Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26*, 769, 770.
- Chinese Immigration, Prevention of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Broadhurst; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1149.
- Ireland—Emigration Statistics.
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 182, 183.
- Passengers to Places out of Europe—Return Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 138.
- Welsh Statistics, Separate Information as to, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28*, 1130.

Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill
- c. 1r.* *Feb. 22*, 527.

Epizootic Lymphangitis
- Army Horses—Compensation for Officers' Horses destroyed.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1287, 1288.

[*cont.*

Epizootic Lymphangitis—*cont.*
Cattle—Result of Inquiry into Epizootic Abortion.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 27,* 1028, 1029.
Ireland, Outbreak in—Claims of Waterford County Council, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1267.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 320.

Equalisation of Rates Act
See London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894, Amendment Bill.

Essex and Suffolk Equitable Insurance Society Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Estimates
See also Civil Service, Army, etc., Estimates.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 23.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid.]
Business of the House, Course of, *Feb. 22,* 522.
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1453.
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1156-1158.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1091, 1096.

Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Aliens Act and Political Refugees—Case of Alexander Onix, *Feb. 26,* 779.
Army—Defaulter's Sheet, System of making Entries upon, *Feb. 22,* 490.
Child-Insurance, Legislative Proposals for Restricting, *Feb. 22,* 506.
Congo Free State Administration, Proposals for Reform of, *Feb. 26,* 774.
Foreign Vessels, Steerage Accommodation in, *Mar. 1,* 1309.
Joint Stock Companies Acts—Date of Presenting Committee Report, *Feb. 22,* 508.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 851.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Commission Recommendations, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26,* 787.
South African War—Stores and Supplies, Commission of Inquiry into, *Feb. 27,* 1052.
Trade Disputes, Exclusion of Foreign Contract Labour during, proposed, *Feb. 26,* 851-854, 855, 861.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21,* 363.
Navy—Flogging, Abolition of, *Feb. 21,* 363.

Exchequer Bonds
Numbers of Bonds drawn for Payment, Delay in Publication of.
Q. Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26,* 777.

Exhibitions, International
Board of Trade Official to supervise Appointment of, proposed.
Os. Lord Balcarres, *Feb. 27,* 1056; Mr. McKenna, 1057.
Contributions to, by the British Exchequer—Lack of Control over Details of Expenditure.
Os. Lord Balcarres, *Feb. 27,* 1055, 1056; Mr. R. Duncan, 1056, 1064; Mr. McKenna, 1057, 1058; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1058-1061; Mr. McCrae, 1061; Mr. Paul, 1062; Mr. Morton, 1062; Mr. Dalziel, 1062; Mr. Chiozza-Money, 1064; Mr. Paul, *Feb. 28,* 1205-1207; Mr. McKenna, 1207, 1208; Mr. Morton, 1208; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1208, 1209.

Explosives
Reports on Explosions, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 72, 73, 107.

Explosives Act, 1875
Picric Acid—Order in Council Exempting certain Mixtures, Presented, *Feb. 26,* 705, 762.

Exports and Imports
Foreign Import Duties on Goods from United Kingdom—Statement Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 115.

Faber, Lord
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14,* 14.

Factories and Workshops
Flax and Tow Spinning, Report on, Presented, *Feb. 26,* 704, 761.
Inspectors
Examination Subjects for.
Qs. Mr. C. Money, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1024, 1025.
Qualifications of Candidates.
Q. Mr. H. J. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Mar. 1,* 1305, 1306.
Women, Proposals as to Increase in Number of.
Qs. Mr. King, Mr. H. J. Tennant, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28,* 1127.
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 22,* 455, 487.

Factory and Workshops Act, 1901
Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries—Regulations, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 130.
Home Work—Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 130.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
Courthouses, Control of, *Mar. 1*, 1268.
Crossrea—Case of J. Norris and Wife, *Mar. 2*, 1390.
Cusack Estate, Sale of, Reinstatement Effected, etc., *Feb. 21*, 348.
Drumlish Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Feb. 26*, 787.
Granard Estate Turbary rights, *Feb. 26*, 793.
Granard and Cloonagh Evening Postal Collection, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 358.
Jessop (Doory) Estate—Reinstatement of Mrs. Moran and J. Rhatigan, *Mar. 1*, 1268, 1269.
Land Commission—Mr. McElligott, Appointment of, as valuer, *Feb. 21*, 346, 347; *Feb. 26*, 767.
Longford—Post Office Hours of Business, *Feb. 21*, 357, 358.
Maconahy Estate, Delay in Sale of, *Feb. 21*, 346.
Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, Grant for, *Mar. 1*, 1269.
Post Office Parcels Post—Increase in Maximum Weight allowed, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1131.
Sligo County Council Printing Contract Tenders for, *Feb. 28*, 1139.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate Grazing Land, Disposal of, *Feb. 27*, 1030.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Egypt—Nile Steamship Company Transferred to German Firm, alleged, *Feb. 27*, 1007.
King's Speech—Address in answer, *Feb. 20*, 278.
Transvaal
  Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 278, 279.
  White Labour, Effect of Stoppage of Chinese Labour on, *Mar. 11*, 1323.

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1443, 1447.
Post Office Wages—Proposals as to Inquiry, etc., *Feb. 20*, 216.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1087.

Ferrard, Viscount
Representative Peer for Ireland—Right to Vote at Elections Established, *Mar. 1*, 1249.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act (1893) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 23*, 699.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
Jurors' and Voters' Lists—Alteration of Law as to Expenses, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1145.
Wexford—Post Office—Charge for Private Bags, *Mar. 1*, 1322.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Army Officers—Tailors Employed by Candidates, *Feb. 27*, 1013.
Bills partly considered, Carrying over to the next Session, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1121.
Carrickmore—Removal of Dungannon Club Placards by Police, *Feb. 27*, 1030.
Comyn Kenny Estate, Delay in Re-selling, *Feb. 27*, 1031.
Insurance Companes, British—Annual Official Audit and Establishment of Guaranteed Government Company, proposed, *Feb. 27*, 1027.
Irish Language—Teaching in Schools *Feb. 20*, 215.
Meat, Boneless—Inspection of Imports, *Feb. 20*, 213.
Members of Parliament—Payment of
  Election Expenses and Salaries, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 773.
Post Office Wages—Proposals as to Inquiry, *Feb. 22*, 492.
Royal Canal, Condition of, Scarcity of Boats, etc., *Feb. 22*, 493.
Tuberculosis in Animals
  Bovine Tuberculosis Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *Feb. 20*, 214.
  Compulsory Slaughter, Compensation for, *Feb. 20*, 212.

Fiennes, Mr. E. E. [Oxfordshire, Banbury]
Transvaal White Labour, Condition of, *Mar. 1*, 1283.

Fiji
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Finch, Rt. Hon. G. H. [Rutland]
Education Acts Amendment—Policy of the Government, *Feb. 28*, 1133.
Irish Legislative Proposals, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1033.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanark, N.E.]
Houses in Scotland, Letting of, Amendment of Law as to, proposed, *Feb. 20*, 305.

Fingringhoe
War Office, Purchase of Land at.
Q. Mr. A. L. Lever: *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1290.

Finland
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

First Commissioner of Works
Right Hon. L. Harcourt.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Lord Tweedmouth.

First Lord of the Treasury
Right Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Firth of Forth
Trawling, Illegal, Prohibition of.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb. 26*, 790, 791.

Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection
Attitude of the Country towards.
O. Mr. Maddison, *Feb. 20*, 299, 300.
Debate on (Lords), *Feb. 22*, 456.
Attitude of the Country towards, 471.
Colonies, Preferential Treatment for, 471, 476.
Corn, Duty on, 473, 475, 485, 486.
Correspondence between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour, 464, 465, 471, 472.
Food, Taxation of, 474, 475, 485.
Free Trade, Effect of, on the Industries of the Country, 470.
General or Penal Tariff, Proposals as to, 473, 475.
Imports and Exports
Return as to, for 1903–5—Tabling, proposed, 456, 457, 466, 467.
Statistics as to, 467, 480, 482.
Industries
Free Trade, Effect of, on, 470.
Prosperous Condition of, alleged, 456, 458.
Protection, Proposals as to, 484, 485.
Retaliation, Proposals as to, 478, 479.
Tariff Reform Commission, Policy and Work of, 478.
Ten per cent. Duty, Proposals as to, 478, 479.
Thirteen million People on the Verge of Starvation, alleged, 458, 470, 480, 481, 482.
Trade and Commerce—Condition, 456, 460, 467, 468, 483.

Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection— *cont.*
Debates on (Lords)—*cont.*
Unionist Party, Policy of, 461–466, 472, 476, 477–479, 483–486.
Wealth, Unequal distribution of, Causes of, 459.
Discussion of, Opportunity for.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 19*, 174.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 521, 522.
Food, Taxation of.
O. Mr. Maddison, *Feb. 20*, 300.
Revenue derived from.
Os. Mr. P. Pease, *Feb. 20*, 272; Mr. Whittaker, 274.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 763.
Foreign manufactured Goods, Increase in Importation of.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Feb. 20*, 254; Mr. Stuart, 257.
German Tariff, *see* Germany—Customs Tariff.
Omission of Reference to, in the King's Speech.
O. Mr. Dickinson, *Feb. 19*, 142, 143.
Postponement of Debate on.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Feb. 28*, 1149, 1151; Mr. Asquith, 1150.
Russian New Tariff, *see* Russian—Customs Tariff.
Trade and Commerce, Position of.
O. Sir H. Vincent, *Feb. 20*, 254.
Unionist Party Policy, Definition of.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 19*, 178, 179; Mr. Paul, 203, 204.

Fisheries
Ireland
Close Season Inquiries, Procedure in holding.
Q. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1136, 1137.
Herrings, close time for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 795, 796.
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 111.
Scotland
Board, Constitution of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb. 26*, 792.
Sea Fishing Boats, Registry of—Order in Council revoking Proviso, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 133.

Fitzmaurice, Lord — *Under - Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 14.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]

Land Commission Business, Delay in, *Feb. 27*, 1030.

Trinity College Estates, Price asked for, *Feb. 21*, 349.

Flax Industry

Decline of, in United Kingdom, reason for, Proposals for remedying, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26*, 781–783.

Ireland, Encouragement in, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 794.

Flax and Tow

Spinning—Report Presented, *Feb. 26*, 704, 761.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]

Education—Grants, reason for Reduction in, etc., *Feb. 26*, 795.

Herring, close time for proposed, *Feb. 26*, 795.

Newman Estate—Case of T. C. O'Callaghan, *Feb. 28*, 1145.

Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1045.

Rosnalee—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on Mr. Leader's Estate, *Feb. 26*, 796.

Food Supply in Time of War

National Indemnity Committee, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. R. Rea; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 21*, 335.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Foreign Office

Secretary of State—Right Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.

Questions

Proposals as to answering in Absence of Secretary.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Earl Percy, Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 340, 341.
Qs. Mr. J. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr. Runciman, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 504.
Qs. Earl Percy; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Feb. 26*, 802, 803.

Supplementary, Rule as to.
Os. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Earl Percy, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 340, 341.

Forestry

Ireland, Bureau for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1271, 1272.

Forfar

Motor Car Traffic, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 135.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 532.

Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 532–544, 566.

Fortescue, Mr. J. B., Manuscripts of

Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 108.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derby, Ilkeston]

County Councils, Compulsory Hiring Orders issued by, *Mar. 2*, 1388.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* [Wolverhampton, E.]

Grand Committees, Work of, *Feb. 28*, 1191, 1192.

Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1189–1194.

France

Inland Navigable Waterways—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.

Lyons—Report on Chemical, Metal, and other Industries, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Money Order Convention with—Additional Agreement Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 137.

Octroi System—Report Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69, 70.

Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.
2R., *Mar. 2*, 1448.

Friendly Societies

National Debt Account Presented, *Feb. 28*, 1114; *Mar. 1*, 1250.

Report (1905) Presented, *Feb. 23*, 622; *Feb. 26*, 704.

Registry Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1036; *Feb. 28*, 1199.
Increase in.
Os. Mr. Morton, Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 27*, 1036.

Fruit Industry

Committee of Inquiry into—Evidence, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 73, 112.

Fullerton, Mr. H. [Cumberland, Egremont]
Cleator Moor District Postal Facilities' Improvement of, *Feb. 27,* 1028.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Importation, Decision as to, *Mar. 1,* 1283.

Fulwood Urban District Water Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Galway
Parliamentary Election—New Writ, *Feb. 20,* 312.
Queen's College—Report (1904–5), Presented, *Feb. 19,* 72, 111.
United Irish League Resolution as to Hunts, Alleged Intimidation of Special Jurors, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1265.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 320.

Gas Supply Bills
Report Ordered, *Feb. 28,* 1114.

Geneva Convention
Accession of Mexico—Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 118.

Geological Survey and Museum
Report Presented, *Feb. 27,* 905, 1005.

Germany
Agriculture—Report Presented, *Feb. 26,* 703.
Bavaria—Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 22,* 454.
Customs Tariff, New—Effect on British Trade, Result of Representations, etc.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Feb. 20,* 255; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 267.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Mr. C. E. Schwann; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 21,* 344, 345.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28,* 1117, 1118.
Inland Navigable Waterways—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 119.
Paper Industry and Export Trade—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 70.
Sea-fishing Industry and Trade—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 70.
Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69, 70. Indian Trade, Report on, Presented, *Feb. 22,* 454.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
Pilots, Alien, Proposed Legislation as to, *Mar. 1,* 1293.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork County, W.]
Bantry Bay, Restrictions on Trawling in, *Mar. 1,* 1273.
Kilcrohan Parish, Re-sale of Estates in, *Mar. 1,* 1273.
School Building Plans, Decision as to, *Mar. 1,* 1274.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
Collinstown Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Feb. 26,* 770.
Delvin Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Application of C. Clinton, etc., *Feb. 20,* 215.
Land Commission
Future Tenants, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1,* 1266.
Rents, Alleged Disparity in fixing, *Feb. 28,* 1134, 1135.
Land Purchase
Duress, Protection of Tenants against, *Feb. 20,* 214.
Landlords, rights of, *Feb. 20,* 215.
Smythe, Col., Estate of
Reason for Delay in Sale, *Feb. 20,* 214.
Rent Recovery Proceedings, etc., *Feb. 26,* 764.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department.* [Leeds, W.]
Aliens Act
Excess Expenditure under, *Feb. 28,* 1210.
Immigration Board Proceedings, Press Admission to, *Feb. 27,* 1026.
Political Refugees—Case of Alexander Onix, *Feb. 26,* 778, 779.
Rejections in British Ports in 1906, *Mar. 1,* 1295.
Children
Cigarettes, Proposals for Restricting Sale of, *Feb. 27,* 1023.
Insurance of, Legislative Proposal for Restricting, *Feb. 22,* 506.
Underfed, Provision of Meals for, Verdict given against Parents by Judge Bompas, etc., *Feb. 28,* 1129.
Factories and Workshops Inspectors
Examination Subjects for, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1024, 1025; *Mar. 1,* 1306.
Women, Proposals as to Increase in, *Feb. 28,* 1127.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 855.
Lambeth Hairdressers' Trade, Application of Early Closing Order to, *Feb. 26,* 780.
Laundries
Religious Institutions, Inspection of, *Feb. 22,* 507.
Unregulated, Proposals as to Inspection of, etc., *Feb. 26,* 780.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
Liquor Traffic—Return as to Licensing Statistics proposed, *Feb. 27*, 1023.
London Cabmen's Licence Fees, Proposals as to, *Feb. 21*, 343.
Match-box Industry—Effect of Order 81, *Feb. 28*, 1129.
Medical and Dental Acts, Proposals as to amending, *Feb. 28*, 1129.
Musical Piracy, Proposals for Prevention of, *Feb. 21*, 344.
Pentonville Prison—Governor's salary, etc., *Feb. 26*, 779.
Police
  Metropolitan
    Day of Rest, Regulation as to, *Feb. 27*, 1011; *Feb. 28*, 1128.
    Foreign Languages, Facilities for Learning, *Mar. 1*, 1305.
    Price, Mr. H. N., Arrest and Detention of, *Feb. 28*, 1128.
  Passive Resisters' Goods, Police Charge for Storing, *Feb. 27*, 1025.
Polling, Hours for—Extension of Time proposed, *Feb. 21*, 343.
Poor Law—Guardians as Magistrates—Case of H. and C. Blythe, *Feb. 27*, 1026.
Religious and Philanthropic Institutions, Inspection of Industrial Establishments of, *Feb. 28*, 1127.
Trade Disputes
  Foreign Contract Labour, Exclusion of, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 855–857.
Trades Disputes Bill, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1305.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System etc., *Feb. 27*, 1103.
Welsh Church Tithes, etc.—Changes occurring since 1894, *Feb. 23*, 623.
Workmen's Compensation Acts Amendment Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 139.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Glasgow
Duke Street Prison—Rule as to Visiting Committee Presented, *Feb. 19*, 93, 134.
University
  Ordinances of Court Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 135.
  Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 93, 135.

Glasslough
Nationalist and Orange Disturbance—Decision as to Prosecutions, etc.
  Q. Mr. O'Hara; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 771, 772.

Glin
District Schools—Local Government Board Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 456, 488.

Goa
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Gold Coast
Reports, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]
Macedonian Reform Proposals—Attitude of Liberal Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1303.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
Home Rule for Ireland, Question of—Devolution Proposals of the Government, *Feb. 21*, 379–384.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 379.

Goschen, Viscount
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 22*, 477.
Unemployed, Question of, *Feb. 22*, 480, 481.

Granard
Postal Collection, Evening, Decision as to.
  Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 21*, 358.

Granard, Earl of
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 22*, 466–468.
Foreign Commerce and Home Industries, Condition of, *Feb. 22*, 467.
Foreign Seamen on British Ships—Inclusion of Legislation as to, in Merchant Shipping Bill, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1257.

Granard Estate
Sale of, Turbary Rights of Tenants, etc.
  Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Feb. 26*, 793.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Parliamentary Procedure, Proposals as to Revision of, *Feb. 26*, 801.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire and East Coast Railways Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Great Eastern Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 320.

Great Northern Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 321.

Great Northern Railway [Ireland] Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Great Northern [Ireland] and Midland Railways Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Great Western and Rhymney Railway Companies Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Greece
Commercial Matters—Declarations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 118.
King of, Visit of, to England
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 21.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19*, 26.
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Greek Loan
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 23*, 622; *Feb. 26*, 704.

Greenwich Hospital and Travers Foundation
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91, 137.

Grenada
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Grenfell, Lord
Tenure of Appointment as General Commanding in Chief the Forces in Ireland.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 333, 334.

Grey, Right Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Africa, East—Anglo-German Boundary Commission, Increase in Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1069.
Brussels Sugar Convention, Proposals as to Termination of, *Mar. 1*, 1303.
Congo Free State—Administration—Reform proposals, *Feb. 26*, 775.
Egypt—Nile Steamship Company, Alleged Transfer of, to German Firm, *Feb. 27*, 1007.
Macedonian Reform Proposals, Attitude of Liberal Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1304.
Manchuria—Alleged Japanese Interference with British Trade, Date of Evacuation by Troops, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1291.
Newfoundland Fisheries—Indemnity, Defraying out of Imperial Funds, *Feb. 27*, 1072–1074.
Questions, proposals as to Answering during Absence of Secretary to Foreign Office, *Feb. 26*, 802.
Samoa Arbitration Claims, *Feb. 27*, 1075.
Tibet Treaty—Progress of Negotiations with China, *Feb 26*, 775; *Mar. 1*, 1304.

Grey, Right Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
Trade Reports—English equivalents to Foreign Weights and Measures, *Mar. 1*, 1304.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 237.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 237, 238.
Welsh Church, Disestablishment of, *Feb. 20*, 238, 239.

Grimsby District Light Railways
Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454, 488.

Guiana, British
Coolies—Repatriation Regulations.
Q. Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1148.
Demerara, Cause of Disturbances in.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1279.
Indian Labour Ordinance, Tabling proposed Amendments to.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 502.
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
Africa, South—Protection of Native Races under the new Constitution, *Feb. 28*, 1214–1216.
House of Commons Seats, Procedure in securing, by Members, *Feb. 22*, 511.
King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 641.
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1183.
Supply, Alteration in Procedure as to, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1183, 1184.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 641.

H. R. Baines & Company Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Hackney Electricity Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 321.

Haddington
Motor Car Traffic, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 135.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
Africa, South, Garrison in—Cost, Colonial Contribution, etc., *Feb. 22*, 491.
Arsenals and Factories, Re-employment of Men discharged from, *Mar. 1*, 1286.
Clothing Contracts, Publication of Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1016.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Courts-Martial, Press Admission to Trial of Staff Sergeant-Major Hilton, *Feb. 22*, 494.
- Defaulters' Sheet, System of making Entries upon, *Feb. 22*, 490.
- Fingringhoe, War Office, Purchase of Land at, *Mar. 1*, 1290.
- Grenfell, Lord—Tenure of Appointment as General Commanding in Chief the Forces in Ireland, *Feb. 21*, 334.
- Horses, Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak—Compensation for Officers' Horses destroyed, *Mar. 1*, 1288.
- Judge Advocate General—Terms and conditions of Appointment, *Feb. 22*, 492.
- Militia
  - Field Service Dress—Reason for non-supply of Cap, *Feb. 21*, 335.
  - Royal Irish Rifles, Training Arrangement for, *Feb. 28*, 1117.
  - Training Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1289.
- Natal Disturbances—Use of Imperial Troops, *Mar. 1*, 1288.
- Norwich Cavalry Barracks, Decision as to, *Feb. 26*, 773.
- Ordinance, Allocation of Contracts, *Feb. 28*, 1116.
- Plymouth and Cawsand — Annoyance caused by Firing Practice, *Mar. 1*, 1286.
- Pollock's, Colonel, Training Scheme, Army Council Attitude towards, *Feb. 22*, 490.
- Promotions — Majors, Proposals as to seconding, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1287.
- Recruiting—Decrease in Ireland in 1905, Reason for, *Feb. 22*, 491.
- Regimental Marches through Agricultural Districts, Effect of, *Mar. 1*, 1298.
- Royal Hibernian Military School—Religious Qualifications of Sergeant Instructor, *Feb. 21*, 335.
- Russo-Japanese War, General Sir I. Hamilton's Book on—War Office Authorisation, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1017.
- Soldiers in Civil Prisons, Number of, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1018.
- Volunteers
  - Proposals of the Government as to, *Feb. 21*, 334.
  - Uniforms—Responsibility for Contracts, etc., *Feb. 21*, 337.

Halifax, Viscount
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 918–920.
- Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Proposals as to Self-Government for, *Feb. 27*, 920–925.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Hickman Estate Shooting Rights—Case of P. Cahill, *Feb. 22*, 514, 515.

Halsbury, Earl of
- Marine Insurance Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1251.
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1253.
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 947–953.
- Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Granting Self-Government to, *Feb. 27*, 947.

Hammersmith
- Exhibition—Conditions of Leasing Land, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. S. Wortley, *Feb. 26*, 789.
- Margravine Road, Postal District of.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1260.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 321.

Hampshire
- Parliamentary Election—New Writ for Northern Division, *Feb. 27*, 1003.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 321.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N. E., Rossendale]
- House of Commons
  - Arrangements, Consideration of, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 512.
  - Outer Lobby Vacant Panels, Proposals as to Decorating, *Feb. 27*, 1007.
  - Sale of Bills Office, Situation of, *Feb. 22*, 512.
  - Seats, Procedure in Securing, by Members, *Feb. 22*, 510.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Aliens Act—Political Refugees—Case of Alexander Onix, *Feb. 26*, 778.
- Education—Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 196, 197.
- Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1447.
- Fiscal Policy
  - Opportunity for Discussion of, *Feb. 22*, 521, 522.
- Foreign Seamen on British Ships, *Feb. 19*, 195.
- Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1453.
- King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 193.
- Ladies' Gallery—Removal of Grille, etc., *Feb. 22*, 521.

[*cont.*

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
- Liquor Licensing Absence of Legislative proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 194.
- Members of Parliament, Free Postage for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1310, 1311.
- Natal, Disturbances in, *Feb. 19*, 199.
- National Telephone Company—Position of employees, *Feb. 26*, 787.
- Navy—Dockyard Employees' Grievances as to Wages, Conditions of Labour, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1375, 1376.
- Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1163, 1164.
- Speaker, Election of, *Feb. 13*, 12.
- Trade Disputes Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 196.
- Transvaal
    - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 194, 195.
    - Self-Government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 199.
- Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1104.
- Unemployed Workmen Amendment Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 198.
- Women's Suffrage Question, *Feb. 19*, 198.
- Working Classes, Condition of, *Feb. 19*, 200.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Deputy-Chairman, Alteration in *Status* of, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1174.
- Grand Committees
    - Procedure—Granting Power of Closure to Chairman, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1172–1174.
    - Work of, *Feb. 28*, 1171, 1172.
- Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1170–1175.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- Crown Lands, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1315.
- Ecclesiastical Disorders Royal Commission Report, Date of Issue of, *Feb. 27*, 1034.
- Transvaal—Native Labour, Proposals for Improving Kaffir Compounds, *Feb. 28*, 1121.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
- National Gallery Directorship Vacancy, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1295.

Harris, Lord
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 26*, 721–734.

Harrowby, Earl of
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 967–972.

Haslington Corporation Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Haversham, Lord
- Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 15.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Army—Number of Soldiers in Civil Prisons, *Feb. 27*, 1018.
- Customs and Excise—Overtime in Statistical Office, Payment for, *Mar. 1*, 1315.
- Feeble-minded Commission, Appointments to, *Feb. 27*, 1054.
- Housing of the Working Classes Acts, Administration of, *Feb. 27*, 1027.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 876.
- Labour Bureaux, Working of—Publication of Inspectors' Report, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1313.
- Police, Metropolitan—Facilities for Learning Foreign Languages, *Mar. 1*, 1304, 1305.
- Russo-Japanese War, General Sir I. Hamilton's Book on—War Office Authorisation, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1017.
- Unemployed, Condition of—Absence of Legislative Measures Dealing with, etc., *Feb. 26*, 876–883.
- Wireless Telegraphy Bill, 2R. *Feb. 28*, 1211.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- County Infirmary Committees—Reduction of Number of Members for Quorum, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 513.
- Forestry Bureau, Establishment of, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1271.
- Local Government Board Financial Year, Alteration in Date of, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 512.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorks. N.R. Thirsk]
- Agricultural Rates Act Grants, Basis for Calculating, *Feb. 28*, 1131.

Hemphill, Lord
- Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 15.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
- Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1394, 1445.
- Post Office Wages—Proposals as to Inquiry, *Feb. 20*, 216; *Feb. 26*, 787.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Bucks, Wycombe]
- Indian Army Administration—Tabling Opinions of Lord Elgin, Lord Cromer, etc., *Mar. 2*, 1388.

Herrings
Close Time for, on Irish Coast, proposed. *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 795, 796.

Herschell, Lord
Agricultural Districts, Depopulation of, *Feb. 19*, 34.
Anglo-Japanese Agreement, *Feb. 19*, 32.
Colonial Conference, *Feb. 19*, 33.
Colonial Marriages, Importance of Legalising in Great Britain, *Feb. 19*, 35, 36.
Denmark, King of, Death of, *Feb. 19*, 31.
India
  Army Administration, *Feb. 19*, 33.
  Visit of Prince and Princess of Wales to, *Feb. 19*, 31.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 30.
Macedonia, Condition of, *Feb. 19*, 33.
Norway, and Sweden, Dissolution of Union between, *Feb. 19*, 32.
Russo-Japanese War, Termination of, *Feb. 19*, 31.
Trade Disputes Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 35.

Hervey, Capt. F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 363.
Navy
  Estimates, Items improperly Placed on, *Mar. 1*, 1355.
  Flogging in, Abolition of, *Feb. 21*, 363.
  Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, *Mar. 1*, 1354.
  Officers, Training of, New Scheme for, *Mar. 1*, 1356–1358.
  Shipbuilding Programme, *Mar. 1*, 1353.
  Stokers, New Regulations for, *Mar. 1*, 1357, 1358.
  Strength and Efficiency of, *Mar. 1*, 1352, 1353.

Hickman Estate
Shooting Rights on—Case of P. Cahill. *Qs.* Mr. Halpin; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 514, 515.

Higham, Mr. J. S. [Yorks., W. R., Sowerby]
Education Act—Police Charge for Storing Passive Resisters' Goods, *Feb. 27*, 1025.

Highland Society's Show
See under Scotland.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
Africa, East—Land Grants, Tabling Returns as to, *Mar. 1*, 1297.
Game Preservation in Tropical Africa, *Mar. 1*, 1297.

Hills, Mr. J. W. [Durham]
Indian Coolie Labour for the Transvaal Conditions of, *Feb. 28*, 1126.

Historical Manuscripts
Fortescue, J. B., Esq., Report on Manuscripts of, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 108.
Verulam, Earl of, Report on Manuscripts of, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 108.
Wells, Dean and Chapter of, Calendar of Manuscripts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 108.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hants, New Forest]
Army, Promotion of Majors, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1287.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 266, 267.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 266.
Nigeria—Information as to rising near Sokoto, *Feb. 27*, 1022.
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1049.

Holmfield & Southowram Light Railway (Amendment and Extension of Time)
Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 114.

Holyhead Water Bill
l. 1R.*, *Feb. 26*, 702.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.

Honduras, British
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 116.

Hop Crop
Returns—Giving Actual instead of Estimated Produce, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 28*, 1132.

House of Commons
See Parliament—House of Commons.

House of Lords
See Parliament—House of Lords.

Housing of the Working Classes
Public Works, Housing Accommodation for Men engaged on.
  Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28*, 1130, 1131.

Housing of the Working Classes Acts
Administration, Information as to.
  Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 27*, 1027.
Scotland, Application to.
  Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Mar. 1*, 1320, 1321.

Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 525.

Houston, Mr. R. P. [Liverpool, W. Toxteth]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 599.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 599–603.

Huddersfield Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 322.
2R.* *Feb.* 27, 1004.

Hull (Channel Islands Animals) Landing Place
Revocation Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 139.

Hull Joint Dock Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Cattle Importation, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1314.
Keyham Harbour Works, Granite used in, *Mar. 1*, 1300.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 900.
Trade, Condition of, necessity for Fiscal Reform, etc., *Feb. 26*, 900, 901.

Huntingdon
Polling District, Order altering, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 128.

Ikerrin, Lord
Appointment of, as Inspector of Irish Produce sent to England.
Qs. Mr. E. Barry, Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 349, 350.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 513.

Imbeciles and Feeble-minded Persons
Commission of Inquiry, Vote for Expenses of.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Feb. 27*, 1053; Mr. McKenna, 1053; Mr. C. Hay, 1054; Mr. Burns, 1054.

Imperial Institute
Indian Section—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 112.

Imperial Ottoman Guaranteed Loan
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 93, 120.

Income Tax
Assessments (1904 and 1905)—Return ordered, *Feb. 22*, 489.
Collection in Scotland, assimilating Procedure with English System, proposed.
Qs. Mr. McCrae, Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 22*, 505, 506.

India
Administration
Advisory Boards for Consultative Purposes, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 816, 844; Mr. J. Morley, 844, 845.
Legislative Council:
Elected Members on, increasing Number of, proposed.
O. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 816.
Local Self-Government, Extension of Powers of, proposed,
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 816–818; Sir H. Cotton, 818-822; Sir J. Jardine, 830, 831; Mr. Rees, 833, 834; Mr. T. H. Davies, 837, 838; Mr. Smeaton, 839–841; Mr. J. Morley, 845; Earl Percy, 849, 850.
Viceroy's Council
Elected Members on, increasing Number of, proposed.
O. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 816.
Indian Representatives on, Appointment of, proposed.
O. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 816.
Army
Administration.
Os. Lord Herschell, *Feb. 19*, 33; Marquess of Ripon, 51.
Opinions of Lord Cromer, Lord Elgin, etc., Tabling proposed.
Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Mar. 2*, 1388.
Papers Presented, *Feb. 19*, 73, 112; *Feb. 23*, 621; *Feb. 26*, 703.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 22.
Officers—Vacation of Appointment, Right of Residence during,
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Feb. 27*, 1012.
Assam, *see that title*.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Bengal

Director of Public Instruction, Procedure in Appointing.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *Ar.* Mr. J. Morley, *Mar. 1,* 1301, 1302.

Partition of, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26,* 811–815; Sir H. Cotton, 822–830; Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, 835, 836; Mr. T. H. Davies, 837; Mr. Smeaton, 838; Mr. J. Morley, 842–844; Earl Percy, 847.

Indian Public Feeling against.
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26,* 811–813; Sir H. Cotton, 823–825; Mr. Rees, 832.

Tabling Papers as to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Mar. 1,* 1302, 1303.

Modification of Scheme—Creation of New Province in Western Part of Bengal, proposed.
Os. Sir H. Cotton, *Feb. 26,* 828, 829; Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, 836.

Necessity for, and Advantages of the Scheme.
Os. Sir H. Cotton, *Feb. 26,* 825, 826; Earl Percy, 847–850.

Orders issued by the Unionist Government.
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26,* 813; Sir H. Cotton, 824.

Papers Presented, *Feb. 19,* 73, 112.

Planters, Opinion and Interests of.
O. Mr. Rees, *Feb. 26,* 832, 833.

Political Reasons for, alleged.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, *Feb. 26,* 836; Mr. Smeaton, 838; Mr. J. Morley, 842, 843.

Civil Service

Examinations—Revision of Paragraph 8, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 85, 131.

Leave, Penalties for overstaying—Assimilating Civil to Military Regulations, proposed.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Feb. 22,* 493.

Coolie Labour for the Transvaal, Conditions of.
Q. Mr. Hills; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28,* 1126.

India—*cont.*

Education of Coolie Children, Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. J. Morley, *Feb. 22,* 503.

Financial Condition, Information as to.
Q. Sir E. Sasson; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Mar. 1,* 1296.

Legislative Council, *see under subheading* Administration.

Loans.

England, raised in—Return Presented, *Feb. 19,* 86, 131.

India, raised in—Return Presented, *Feb. 19,* 85, 131.

Sanitary Measures—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 73, 111.

Secretary of State, Establishment of—Order in Council approving Revisions, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 85, 133.

Statistical Abstract, 1894–1904, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 73, 111.

Railways—Loishilman proposed Railway, Information as to.
Q. Mr. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Feb. 26,* 771.

Trade Review (1904–5) Presented, *Feb. 19,* 73, 111.

Viceroy's Council, *see under subheading* Administration.

Wales, Prince and Princess of, Visit of.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19,* 21; Lord Herschell, 31; Marquess of Lansdowne, 37; Marquess of Ripon, 49; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 152, 153.

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 21.

India Office

Secretary of State—Right Hon. J. Morley

Under-Secretary—Right Hon. J. E Ellis

Indo-China

Tonquin—Minute declaring Hanoi to be an Unhealthy Place, Presented, *Feb. 26,* 705, 761.

Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 22,* 454

Industrial and Provident Societies

Report (1905) Presented, *Feb. 23,* 622; *Feb. 26,* 704.

Inebriate Retreats

Ireland—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 111.

Insurance

British Companies—Annual Official Audit proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 27,* 1027.

[*cont.*

Insurance—*cont.*

Children, *see that title.*

Guaranteed Government Company, Establishment of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 27*, 1027.

Intoxicating Liquors Local Veto (Ireland) Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 28*, 1151.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Right Hon. J. Bryce.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Right Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry

Administration of.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 182–193; Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 417.

Cost of
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 185; Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 417.

Policy, Changes in.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Feb. 20*, 239–247; Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 418–425.

Agricultural Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19* 72, 110.

Assizes, Winter—Orders in Council Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 125.

Bankruptcy Courts—Annual Returns Presented, *Mar. 2*, 1386.

Church Temporalities—Accounts and Report Presented, *Feb. 26*, 704, 763.

Committals for Trial—Returns Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91, 125.

Condition of—Responsibility of the British Government for lack of Progress, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 182–185; Colonel Saunderson, *Feb. 21*, 375, 376; Mr. J. Devlin, 389, 390, 394; Mr. C. Craig, 413, 414.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

County Infirmary Committees—Reduction of Number of Members for Quorum, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 513.

Courthouses, Control of—Longford Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1268.

Crimes Act, Withdrawal of.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Feb. 19*, 45; Marquess of Ripon, 58; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 162; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 176; Mr. J. Redmond, 189, 190; Mr. W. Long, *Feb. 21*, 428, 429.

Ireland—*cont.*

Crimes Act, etc.—*cont.*

Proclamation Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 127.

Crimes and Outrages in Ulster.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Feb. 21*, 403–405.

Development Grant Fund, Accounts—Report proposed.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1120.

Devolution proposal.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19*, 28; Marquess of Lansdowne, 43, 44; Marquess of Ripon, 57, 61; Marquess of Salisbury, 61; Mr Dickenson, 144; Mr. Acland, 146 147; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 161, 162; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 175, 176; Colonel Saunderson, *Feb. 21*, 372; Mr. Gordon, 379–382, 384; Mr. Dodd, 394; Mr. Sloan, 398; Mr. T. W. Russell, 402, 406; Mr. C. Craig, 411; Mr. Bryce, 415; Mr. W. Long, 425–433; Mr. Dillon, 435–438; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 439.

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 23.

Drainage, Arterial—Result of Commission of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1262.
Q. Mr. Long; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1276.

Education, *see title* Education, Ireland.

Emigration, *see under title* Emigration and Immigration.

Evictions

Claims for Reinstatement—Tabling Returns proposed.
Q. Mr. Long; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1275, 1276.

Returns Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 83, 111, 124.

Financial Prosperity of.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Feb. 21*, 375; Mr. J. Devlin, 389, 390.

Forestry Bureau, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1271, 1272.

Home Rule Question.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 180–182, 187, 190–193; Mr. W. O'Brien, *Feb. 20*, 242–244; Mr. Bottomley, 298; Colonel Saunderson, *Feb. 21*, 372–379; Mr. Gordon, 380–384; Mr. J. Devlin, 386; Mr. O'Grady, 399; Lord Castlereagh, 400; Mr. T. W. Russell, 406, 407; Mr. C. Craig, 411-414; Mr. Bryce, 416, 417; Mr. W. Long, 425, 430–433; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 439–444

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Home Rule Question—*cont.*

esolution received from Australian Parliaments.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb.* 27, 1018.

Unionist Party in the House of Lords, Influence of.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, *Feb.* 22, 462.

Inebriate Retreats—Report Presented, *Feb.* 19, 80, 111.

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Land Act of 1903, Land Commission, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

Law Courts, *see that title.*

Legislative proposals, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Finch; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 27, 1033.

Lunacy, *see under title* Lunacy.

Motor Transport in Agricultural Districts, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar.* 1, 1272.

etty Sessions Clerks, Papers set at Examination of.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar.* 2, 1389.

"Planter," Definition of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 28, 1141.

Population of, Decline in.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb.* 19, 182, 183; Mr. J. Devlin, *Feb.* 21, 390.

Post Office, *see under* Post Office.

Public Records—Report Presented, *Feb.* 19, 72, 111.

Representative Peers, *see under* Parliament—House of Lords.

Statistics as to Banking, Railways and Shipping, Presented, *Feb.* 19, 77, 110.

Treasury Solicitor, Qualifications of—Minute Presented, *Feb.* 19, 93, 124.

Trinity College

Estates—Decision as to Adoption of Recommendations of Commission.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 21, 348, 349.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar.* 1, 1262.

Students, Disorderly Conduct Among, Powers of Senate to deal with, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 21, 357.

Works, Board of—Case of Mr. R. McConkey Reason for non-award of Pension, etc.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. McKenna. *Feb.* 26, 766.

Irish Language

Carts, Decision as to use on.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 22, 514.

Teaching in Schools, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 20, 215, 216.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 22, 515, 516.

Irish Lights Commission Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb.* 22, 528.

Iron and Steel

Swedish Magnetic Iron Ore, Proposed Export Duty on.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb.* 21, 339.

Italy

Milan Exhibition—Vote for, *Feb.* 27, 1054; 1199.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Feb.* 27, 1054; Lord Balcarres, 1055; Mr. Paul, 1056; Mr. McKenna, 1056–1058, 1063, 1064; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1059; Mr. C. Devlin, 1063; Mr. Bottomley 1064; Mr. H. Cox, 1065.

Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb.* 19, 69; *Feb.* 22, 454.

Iveagh, Viscount

Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb.* 13, 3.

Ivory Coast

Trade Report, Presented, *Feb.* 19, 70.

Japan

Anglo-Japanese Agreement

Despatch to H.M. Ambassador at St. Petersburg, Presented, *Feb.* 19, 76, 118.

Presented, *Feb.* 19, 67, 118.

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb.* 19, 21.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, 26; Lord Herschell, 32; Marquess of Ripon, 49.

Tea Culture—Report Presented, *Feb.* 19, 70.

Trade Reports Presented, *Feb.* 19, 69, 70.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]

India, Administration of—Extension of Powers of Local Self-Government, proposed, *Feb.* 26, 830, 831.

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb.* 26, 830.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham.]
Naval Dockyards.
Discharges, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1300.
Wages and Conditions of Employment, Grievances as to, *Mar. 1*, 1365–1370.

Jessop (Doory) Estate
Reinstatement of Mrs. Moran and J. Rhatigan, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1268–1270.

Johnson, Mr. J. [Gateshead]
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1105.

Joicey, Lord
Introduced, to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 15.

Joint Stock Banks
Bank of England Notes, Regulations as to Cashing.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 26*, 777.

Joint Stock Companies Acts
Committee of Inquiry Report, Date of Issuing.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Feb. 22*, 508, 509.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Aliens Act, Excess Expenditure under, *Feb. 28*, 1209, 1210.
Redistribution Committee, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1040, 1044.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Bradford Child-Feeding Order, Prosecutions under, Cost of Meals, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1129, 1132.
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1409–1412.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Ballinacurra Sewer Works, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1033.
Limerick Post Office—Inspector of Postmen—alleged Delay in filling Vacancy, *Feb. 22*, 518.
Pilots, Alien, Legislative Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1306, 1307.
Shannon River Fisheries—Return as to Revenue, etc., proposed, *Feb. 26*, 766.
Works Board—Case of Mr. R. McConkey, *Feb. 26*, 766.

Judge-Advocate-General
Appointment, Terms and Conditions of.
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 22*, 492.

Judicial Statistics.
Scotland—Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 116.

Jurors' Expenses Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 23*, 699.

Jurors' Lists
Expenses—Alteration of Law proposed by Wexford County Council.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1145.

Keadue
Telegraph Office, proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. OKelly; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1322, 1323.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Merchant Shipping—Legislative proposals, *Feb. 19*, 140.

Kennaway, Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1184, 1185.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Bank of England Notes, Regulations as to Cashing, by Joint Stock Banks, *Feb. 26*, 777.
Cavan Land Commission Judgments, Delay in giving, *Feb. 21*, 355.

Kent Collieries Electricity Supply Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Kent Electric Power Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Kerry
Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1277.

Kettering Water Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 322.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Keyham Harbour
Works, Granite used in.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. L. Jones, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Pirie, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 1*, 1300, 1301.

Kidderminster Gas Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Salary of Mr. Porter, *Feb. 21*, 352.
Land Commission, Rents, Reduction in since 1903, *Feb. 28*, 1136.
Land Purchase—Untenanted Land, Price asked for, *Feb. 21*, 347.

Kilchreest
Police, Extra, Reason for, and Cost of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1263.

Kilcrohan Parish
Estates Purchased in, Resale of.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1273, 1274.

Killescragh
Fahey, M., Disturbance at House of, Police Efforts to Trace Offenders, etc.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1141, 1142.

Kiltimagh
Medical Officer, Qualifications of, Reason for rejecting Candidate, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1264, 1265.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Navy—Expenditure Statistics, 1895–1906, *Mar. 1*, 1335.
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1050.

King, Mr. A. J. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
Factory Inspectors, Women, Proposals as to Increase in, *Feb. 28*, 1127.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
India
Army—Officers, Vacation of Appointment by—Right of Residence, *Feb. 27*, 1012.
Civil Service Leave, Penalties for overstaying—Assimilating Civil to Military Regulations, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 493.

King's Speech on the Opening of Parliament
Address in Answer.
For Details of Debates on Amendments, see Subjects of Amendments.
Adjournment, Motion for.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 20*, 307.
Chinese Labour in the Transvaal—*Motion* (Mr. Forster) *Feb. 22*, 532, *Feb. 23*, 624.
Closuring Debate on—Suspension of Twelve O'Clock Rule.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 26*, 805; Mr. Asquith, 806.
Coasts, Erosion of—*Motion* [Mr. S. Wilson] *Feb. 26*, 862, 865.
Debates, *Feb. 19*, 25, 140; *Feb. 20*, 217; *Feb. 21*, 360; *Feb. 22*, 531; *Feb. 23*, 624; *Feb. 26*, 809.
Devolution for Ireland, Proposals as to—*Motion* [Colonel Saunderson], *Feb. 21*, 372.

King's Speech on the Opening of Parliament—*cont.*
Address in Answer—*cont.*
Flogging in the Navy—*Motion* [Mr. S. MacNeill], *Feb. 20*, 307.
Foreign Contract Labour during times of Trade Disputes—*Motion* [Sir W. Evans-Gordon], *Feb. 26*, 851, 855.
Letting of Houses in Scotland—*Motion* [Mr. A. Cross], *Feb. 20*, 302.
Message from the King, *Mar. 2*, 1385.
Motion [Marquess of Northampton], *Feb. 19*, 25—*Seconder* [Lord Herschell], 30.
Motion [Mr. W. H. Dickinson], *Feb. 19*, 140—*Seconder* [Mr. Acland] 145.
Proceedings on, to have Precedence—*Motion* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Feb. 21*, 359.
Reported from the Lords, *Feb. 22*, 449.
Roads, Maintenance of, from Imperial Funds—*Motion* [Colonel Lockwood], *Feb. 26*, 902.
Unemployed, Legislative Measure for—*Motion* [Mr. C. Hay], *Feb. 26*, 876.
Unrest in India, and Partition of Bengal—*Motion* [Mr. H. Roberts], *Feb. 26*, 811, 830.
Text of, *Feb. 19*, 21–24.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 322.
2R.* *Feb. 28*, 1113.

Kingswinford
Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 88, 128.

Kinross, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father. *Feb. 13*, 3.

Knaresborough, Baron
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Knott End Railway (Extension of Time) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Labour
Bureaux, Working of—Publication of Inspector's Report, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Mar. 1*, 1313.
Foreign Contract Labour during times of Trade Disputes, Objections to Introduction of.
Os. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, *Feb. 26*, 851–854, 861; Sir W. Bull, 854, 855; Mr. H. Gladstone, 855–857; Mr. Crooks, 857–861; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 861.
Hours of, Regulation of, proposed.
O. Mr. G. H. Roberts, *Feb. 26*, 885

Labour Pensions Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 28*, 1152.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Cottages without Allotments, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1278.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
Introduction of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 19*, 140; Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 438.

Lagos
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb.* 19, 68,116.

Lambert, Mr. G.—(*Lord of the Admiralty*), [Devon, S. Molton]
Hospital at Cape Town, Date of Completion of, *Mar. 1*, 1377.
Keyham Harbour Works, Granite used in, *Mar. 1*, 1300, 1301.
Surgeons, decision as to post-graduate courses for, *Mar. 1*, 1378.

Lambeth
Hairdressers' Trade, Application of Early Closing Order to.
Q. Mr. S. Collings; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 26*, 780.

Lancashire
Polling Districts—Orders Altering, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 88,128.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 322.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Accounts—*Feb. 20*, 205, 210.

Land Act, 1903
Amendment of, Necessity for.
O. Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 437.
Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 83, 124.

Land Commission, Ireland
Baggot and Tuckey, Messrs., Term of Employment of, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1144.
Business, Delay in Proceeding with.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1030.
Commissioners, Complaints against—Kerry County Council Resolution.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 797.

Land Commission, Ireland—*cont.*
Future Tenants, Proposals as to, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1266.
McElligott, Mr. Appointment of, as Valuer.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 346, 347, *Feb. 26*, 767.
Proceedings—Returns Presented—*Feb. 19*, 75, 83, 110, 124.
Rents, Disparity in Fixing, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1134, 1135.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1135, 1136.
Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1065; *Feb. 28*, 1199.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Feb. 27*, 1066; Mr. McKenna, 1066, 1067;; Mr. Morton, 1068.

Land Purchase, Ireland
See also Names of Estates.
Bonus, Payment of.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 27*, 1066, 1067
Compulsory Powers, Proposals as to Authorising.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 347.
Congested Districts, Compulsory Purchase in, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb.* 26, 797.
Duress, Protection of Tenants against.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 20*, 214.
Estates Commissioners—Report of Proceedings Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 110.
Evicted Tenants, Grants to.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*, 162; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 177.
Grants, Proposals as to.
Q. Lord Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27*, 1034.
Landlords
Refusal to sell by, Powers of Estates Commissioners to deal with, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 768.
Rights of, Powers of interference with, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 20*, 215.
Legislative Proposals, Absence of.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Feb. 19*, 45; Mr. J. Redmond, 188, 189.
Regulations
Date of Tabling.
Os. Mr. W. Long, *Feb. 27*, 1066; Mr. Bryce, 1068.
Statement by Mr. Long, proposed.
O. Mr. Clancy, *Feb. 27*, 1066.
Untenanted Land, Price asked for, etc.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 347.

Land Registry New Buildings Act
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 121.

Land Tenure Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 524.

Land Values (Assessment and Rating) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 531.

Land Values Taxation, etc. (Scotland) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 524.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 804.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
- Administration of Ireland—Devolution proposals, *Feb. 19*, 43, 44.
- Agricultural Districts, Depopulation of, *Feb. 19*, 46.
- Bills, Date of Introduction of, Inadequate time for Discussion, etc., *Feb. 19*, 46.
- Crimes (Ireland) Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 19*, 45.
- Denmark, King of, Death of, *Feb. 19*, 37.
- Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 22*, 468–477.
- Foreign Commerce and Home Industries, Condition of, *Feb. 22*, 468.
- India, Visit of Prince and Princess of Wales to, *Feb. 19*, 37.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 36, 54.
- Macedonia, Condition of, *Feb. 19*, 39.
- Morocco, Conference of European Powers, *Feb. 19*, 38.
- Norway and Sweden, Dissolution of Union between, *Feb. 19*, 39.
- Religious Education in State Schools, *Feb. 19*, 45.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 41; *Feb. 27*, 988–993.
  - Self-Government, Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 42; *Feb. 27*, 986–988.

Laundries
- Regulated and Unregulated Laundries, Inspection of, Number of Persons employed in, Legislative proposals as to, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. H. J. Tennant; *As.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 26* 779, 780.
- Religious Institutions
  - Inspection of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 22*, 507.
  - List Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 108.

Law Courts, Ireland
- Advertisement of Legal Notices, Regulations as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Condon; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Feb. 26*, 768, 769.
- Supreme Court of Judicature, Accounts—Copy ordered, *Feb. 20*, 212; Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333.

Lawson, Sir W. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
- Speaker, Election of, *Feb. 13*, 4–6.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 365.
- Licences of London Cabmen—Proposal as to Additional charge of Half-a-crown, *Feb. 21*, 343.
- Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 21*, 365.
- Pentonville Prison—Governor's Salary, etc., *Feb. 26*, 779.
- Wines, Basis, Proposals as to Taxing, *Feb. 28*, 1147.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hants, Fareham]
- Navy
  - Armaments, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1340, 1341, 1344.
  - Contracts—Alterations in Specifications, *Feb. 21*, 336; *Feb. 22*, 497.
  - Efficiency of, *Mar. 1*, 1341.
  - Policy, Continuity of, *Mar. 1*, 1337, 1342.
  - Portsmouth Dockyard, Alterations to, *Mar. 1*, 1338, 1382.
  - Rosyth Base, Policy as to, *Mar. 1*, 1338, 1382.
  - Russo-Japanese War, Lessons of, *Mar. 1*, 1340.
  - Shipbuilding
    - Designs, Secrecy with Regard to, *Mar. 1*, 1339.
    - Programme 1906–7, *Mar. 1*, 1338, 1339.
- Navy Estimates, *Mar. 1*, 1335, 1336.
  - Motion to Report Progress, *Mar. 1*, 1379.

Leeward Islands
- Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 117.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
- Africa, South, British Indians in, Position of, and Proposals as to, *Feb. 28*, 1125.
- Army Arsenals and Factories, Re-employment of Men Discharged from, *Mar. 1*, 1286.
- Colonies, Self-Governing—Use of Right of Veto by Home Government, *Feb. 28*, 1115.

[*cont.*

Legge, Col. H.—*cont.*
Transvaal—Chinese Labour.
Ordinance, Proposed Amendment of, *Feb. 28,* 1115.
Repatriation—Notice Required for Obtaining Leave, *Feb. 27,* 1020.

Lehmann, Mr. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Education [Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 2,* 1435.

Leigh, Lord
Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Feb. 19,* 24.

Leith of Fyvie, Baron
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13,* 3.

Lever, Mr. A. L. [Essex, Harwich]
Fingringhoe, War Office Purchase of Land at, *Mar. 1,* 1290.

Lever, Mr. W. H. [Cheshire, Wirrall]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20,* 279.
Old Age Pensions, Necessity for Formulating Scheme for, *Feb. 20,* 279, 280.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough)
Alien Immigrant Arrivals, Reason for Delay in Publishing List of, *Feb. 26,* 769.

Licensed Premises (Election Days) Closing Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 28,* 1152.

Licences
Liquor, *see under* Liquor Traffic.
London Cabmen's Fees—Proposals as to Additional Charge of Half-a-crown.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 21,* 343.

Licensing (Scotland) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22,* 530.

Liddell, Mr. H. [Down, W.]
Donemarna—Alleged Nationalist Assault on Orangemen, etc., *Mar. 1,* 1276.
Sligo County Council Printing Contract, Tenders for, *Feb. 28,* 1139.

Life Assurance Companies
Accounts, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 91, 138.

Light Dues (Abolition) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22,* 524.

Light Railways
See under Railways.

Lights and Lighthouses
General Lighthouse Fund—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19,* 91, 138.

Limerick
Post Office, Inspector of Postmen—Alleged Delay in filling Vacancy.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Feb. 22,* 518.
Prison, Female, Order closing, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 89, 126.

Limited Partnerships Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 1,* 1251.

Liquor Traffic
Brewers' Licences, Particulars as to Issue of (1904–5)—Return ordered, *Feb. 20,* 211; Presented, *Feb. 21,* 333.
Licensing Statistics, Return as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1023.
Omission of reference to, in the King's Speech.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19,* 160; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 174; Mr. J. K. Hardie, 194; Mr. Whittaker *Feb. 20,* 274.

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 805.

Liverpool, Earl of
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13,* 2.

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill
l. 1R.*, *Feb. 26,* 701.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*President of the Board of Trade.* [Carnarvon, etc.]
Aliens, Immigrant Arrivals, Reason for delay Publishing List of, *Feb. 26,* 770.
Canals, Commission of Inquiry, Welsh Representation on, *Feb. 28,* 1130.
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 873–875.
Emigration and Immigration Returns—Separate Information for Wales proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1130.
Flax industry, Decline of, Reason for, Proposals as to Remedy, etc., *Feb. 26,* 782, 783.
German Customs Tariff, New, Effect of, *Feb. 21,* 345; *Feb. 28,* 1118.
Insurance, British Companies — Annual Official Audit and Establishment of Guaranteed Government Company proposed, *Feb. 27,* 1027.
Joint Stock Companies Acts—Date of Presenting Committee Report, *Feb. 22,* 509.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26.* 873.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Merchant Shipping
  - Foreign Seamen, on British Vessels Proposals as to, *Feb. 21*, 344; *Feb.* 22, 508.
  - Foreign Vessels in British Ports
    - Application of Statutory Requirements to, *Feb. 26*, 784.
    - Steerage Accommodation in, *Mar. 1*, 1309.
  - "Ordovician," Cause of loss of, etc., *Feb. 21*, 344; *Feb. 22*, 508.
- Merchant Shipping Amendment Act, Proposals as to, *Feb. 27*, 1028.
- Pilots, Foreign
  - Certificates Granted to, Number and Nationality of Pilots, etc., *Feb. 26*, 785.
  - Legislative Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1293, 1306, 1307.
- Railways
  - Automatic Brakes, Decision as to, *Feb. 26*, 784.
  - Servants, Accidents to from Couplings, etc., and use of Shunting Poles, *Feb, 26*, 784.
- Russian Customs, Tariff, New, *Feb. 26*, 781. *Feb. 28*, 1118.
- Sugar, Beet—Prices (1903-1906), *Mar. 1*, 1293.
- Trade Marks Act 1905, Fees under, *Feb. 26*, 786.
- Trade and Commerce
  - British Firms with Works in Foreign countries, *Mar. 1*, 1307, 1308.
  - Foreign new Customs Tariffs, Effect of, on British Trade, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1308, 1309.
  - Statistics as to British Trade, Compilation of proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1310.
- Unemployed—Statistics as to Skilled and Unskilled Labourers, *Feb. 21*, 345.
- Works, Public, Housing Accommodation for men employed on, *Feb. 28*, 1131.

Local Authorities
- Appointments—Introduction of Political Restrictions on Candidates, Cahirciveen Resolution, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce *Mar. 1*, 1263, 1264.

Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 526.

Local Government Board
- *President*—Right Hon. J. Burns.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. W. Runciman.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
- Dispensary Rules, Order amending, Presented, *Feb. 22*, 456, 487.
- Financial Year, Alteration in Date of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Bryce. *Feb. 22*, 512.
- Re-constitution of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 518.
- Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed) Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 125.

Local Government Board (Scotland)
- Unemployed, Organisation for—Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 135.

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
- *c.* 1R*. *Feb. 22*, 526.

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1889) Amendment Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.
  - 2R., and Bill withdrawn, *Feb. 26*, 904.

Local Government (Scotland) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 530.

Local Government (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 27*, 1035.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 902.
- Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1193, 1194.
- Roads, Maintenance of, out of Imperial Funds, *Feb. 26*, 902.

London
- Cabmen's Licence Fees, Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 21*, 343.
- City of
  - Parliamentary Election—New Writ, *Feb. 19*, 103.
- Street Traffic, *see that title.*

London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 323.

London County Buildings Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 323.

London County Council [Electric Supply] Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 323.

London County Council [General Powers] Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 323.
  - 2R.* *Feb. 27*, 1004.

London County and District Electric Power Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 316.

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894, Amendment Bill
Introduction of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19*, 29; Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 20*, 217; Mr. Stuart, 258.
Scope of.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 27*, 1011.

London and India Docks and Millwall Companies Dock Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 322.

London Locomotion Commission
Travelling Expenses, Vote for.
Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Feb. 27*, 1052; Mr. McKenna, 1052, 1053; Mr. Morton, 1053; Mr. Morton, *Feb. 28*, 1202; Mr. McKenna, 1202.

London Outer Circle Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.
2R.* *Feb. 28*, 1113.

London Southern Tramways Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

London and South Western Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 323.

London Traffic Commission
See Streets—Traffic.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 934–938.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Afflicted Children Bill—Result of Circular Issued to Local Authorities, *Mar. 1*, 1275.
Crimes (Ireland) Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 21*, 428, 429.
Drainage, Arterial—Result of Inquiry, *Mar. 1*, 1276.
Evictions, Claims for Reinstatement, Tabling Returns as to, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1275.
Home Rule Question—Devolution Proposals of the Government, *Feb. 21*, 425–433.

Long, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 425.
Land Commission, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1065.
Land Purchase Regulations, Date of Tabling, *Feb. 27*, 1066.
Queen's Colleges in Belfast and Cork, Endowments for, *Mar. 1*, 1316.
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1048.

Longford
Courthouse, Control of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1268.
Post Office—Hours of Business.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 21*, 357, 358.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Ardrahan—Outrage on Mr. and Mrs. F. Shawe Taylor, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1266.
Army Recruiting—Reason for Decrease in Ireland in 1905, *Feb. 22*, 491.
Ballinderreen—Attack on Mr. Kearney's House, *Feb. 27*, 1032.
Barhane—Case of J. Padden, *Feb. 26*, 764.
Cahirciveen District Council, etc., Appointments, Political Restrictions on Candidates, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1263.
Cawnmore—Disturbance at House of J. Madden, *Mar. 1*, 1263.
Flax Industry
Decline of, in United Kingdom, *Feb. 26*, 781, 783.
Encouragement of, in Ireland, *Feb. 26*, 794.
Galway—United Irish League Resolution as to Hunts, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1265.
Irish Language
Carts, Decision as to Use on, *Feb. 22*, 514.
Teaching in Schools, Proposals as to, *Feb. 22*, 515.
Jurors, Special, Alleged Intimidation of, *Mar. 1*, 1322.
Kiltimagh Medical Officer—Reason for Rejecting Candidate, *Mar. 1*, 1264.
Movine—Compensation to J. Bowman for Injury to Cattle, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1140.
North of Ireland Postal Service to England, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 358, 359.
Sligo
Conspiracy Trials, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 356.
County Council Printing Contract, Tenders for, *Feb. 28*, 1139.

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
Trinity College
Estates—Adoption of Recommendations of Commission, etc., *Feb. 21*, 348, 349.
Students, Disorderly Conduct among—Powers of Senate, etc., *Feb. 21*, 57.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain
Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council
Earl of Crewe.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Ripon.

Lord Warden of the Duchy of Cornwall
Earl of Ducie.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13*, 1.
Marine Insurance Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1253.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1*, 1255.
Speaker, Presentation of, to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 13.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 939–942.
Transvaal, and Orange River Colony, Proposals as to Granting Self-Government to, *Feb. 27*, 942–946.

Louth
Parliamentary Election Campaign at.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Feb. 21*, 377, 378.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
peaker, Election as, *Feb. 13*, 4–12; *Feb. 14*, 13.

Lunacy
Commissioners—Return Presented, *Feb. 19* 84, 139.

Lunacy—*cont.*
Ireland
Increase of Lunacy in.
O. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 183.
Mullingar Asylum, Grant for.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1269.
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 111.
Visitors of Lunatics
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 26*, 703.
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 139.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Dunraven Estates, Sale of and Reinstatements on, *Feb. 28*, 1137.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Boston—Case of H. and C. Blythe, *Feb. 27*, 1026.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 265.
Natal Disturbances—Damage done to Native Crops, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1021.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 265.

Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.
2R.* *Feb. 27*, 1004.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
Navy
Armaments, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1344.
Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 1*, 1342, 1343.
Income Tax Collection in Scotland, Procedure in, *Feb. 22*, 505, 506.
International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1061.
Naval Works Loans Bills, Abandonment of System of, *Mar. 1*, 1343.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester.]
Factories and Workshops Inspectors, Examination Subjects for, *Feb. 27*, 1025.
Volunteers, Uniforms—Responsibility for Contracts, etc., *Feb. 21*, 336, 337.

Macedonia
Administrative Reforms, Progress made with.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*. 153.
Concessions, Attitude of Liberal Government towards.
Q. Mr. Gooch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Mar. 1*, 1303, 1304.
Condition of.
Os. Lord Herschell, *Feb. 19*, 33; Marquess of Lansdowne, 39; Marquess of Ripon, 50, 51.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 22.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
- ligo Conspiracy Trial, alleged Jury Packing at, *Mar. 1*, 1321.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berks, Newbury]
- Transvaal—Chinese Corporal Punishment
  - "Cangue" Use of, *Feb. 28*, 1116.
  - Head Collars and Stocks, alleged Use of, *Feb. 22*, 500.
  - Milner, Lord, Sanction of, *Feb. 22*, 499, 500; *Feb. 28*, 1115.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Monmouth, N.]
- Bank of England Notes, Regulations as to Cashing by Joint Stock Banks, *Feb. 26*, 777.
- County Court Stationery, etc., Contracts, *Mar. 1*, 1317.
- Crown Lands, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1315.
- ustoms and Excise
  - Confiscated Goods, Procedure in Disposing of, *Feb. 28*, 1119.
  - Overtime in Statistical Office, Payment for, *Mar. 1*, 1316.
- Feeble-minded Commission, Vote for Expenses of, *Feb. 27*, 1053.
- Friendly Societies Registry, Increase in Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1036.
- International Exhibitions, Contributions to, *Feb. 27*, 1057, 1058; *Feb. 28*, 1207, 1208.
- Ireland
  - Customs and Excise, Outdoor Department, Promotions in, *Feb. 26*, 769.
  - Education—School Building Plans, Decision as to, *Feb. 27*, 1028; *March 1*, 1274.
  - Land Commission, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1066, 1067.
  - Land Purchase, Bonus, Method of Paying, *Feb. 27*, 1066, 1067.
  - Phœnix Park, Grounds Allotted to Football, *Feb. 28*, 1146.
  - Queens Colleges, Endowment for, *Mar. 1*, 1316, 1317.
  - Shannon River Fisheries—Return as to Revenue etc., proposed, *Feb. 26*, 766.
  - Works, Board of—Case of Mr. R. McConkey, *Feb. 26*, 766.
- London Locomotive Commission—.ote for Travelling Expenses, *Feb. 27*, 1052, 1053; *Feb. 28*, 1202.
- Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1056–1058, 1063, 1064.
- Poor Law Commission of Inquiry, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1054

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Royal Canal, Condition of, Scarcity of Boats, etc., *Feb. 22*, 494.
- South African War, Stores and Supplies Commission of Inquiry into, Date of Presenting Report, *Feb 27*, 1051, 1052.

McLaren, Sir C. B. B. [Leicester, Bosworth]
- Congo Free State Administration, Right of Intervention by European Powers, etc., *Feb. 21*, 342.
- Soudan Frontier, alleged Attacks by Congo Troops on, *Feb. 21*, 341.
- Swedish Magnetic Iron Ore, proposed Export Duty on, *Feb. 21*, 339.
- Transvaal War Contribution Loan, Proposals as to Enforcing Payment of, *Feb. 21*, 338.
- Volunteers, Proposals of the Government as to, *Feb. 21*, 334.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
- Cigarettes, Smoking by Juveniles, Legislative Proposals for Restricting, *Feb. 27*, 1023.
- Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1420–1426.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 247; *Feb. 23*, 625.
- Polling, Hours for—Extension of Time proposed, *Feb. 21*, 343.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 247–250; *Feb. 22*, 498; *Feb. 23*, 625, 632.
  - Mines—Gold Output, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
  - Native Labour, Statistics as to, *Feb 27*, 1018.

McNeale Estate
- Evictions, Alleged Police Assistance at. *Q.* Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 350, 351.

McNeill, Mr. J. S. Swift [Donegal, S.]
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department
  - Plunkett, Sir H., Tenure of Office by, *Feb. 21*, 353, 355.
- Army
  - Grenfell, Lord—Tenure of Appointment as General Commanding in Chief the Forces in Ireland, *Feb. 21*, 333.
  - Royal Hibernian Military School—Religious Qualifications of Sergeant Instructor, *Feb. 21*, 334.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 307; *Feb. 21*, 371.
  - Adjournment, *Motion* for, *Feb. 20*, 307.
- Navy, Flogging in, *Feb. 20*, 307; *Feb. 21*, 372.

[*cont.*

McNeill, Mr. J. S. Swift—*cont.*
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1178–1181.
Question, Use of Member's Name in, *Feb. 28*, 1143.

Maconahy Estate
Sale, Reason for Delay in.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 21*, 346.

McVeigh, Mr. C. [Donegal, E.]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 876.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 876.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 299.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 299.

Madeira
Parcels Post, Amended Warrant, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 92.
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
County Magistracy—Operation of Resolution of 5 May, 1893.
Q. Mr. Boulton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 520.
Property Qualification, Abolition of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Science, College of, etc.—University of London Senate and the Committee Report, *Feb. 26*, 789.

Malta
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Manchester
Belle Vue, Report on Explosion at, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 72, 107.

Manchester Churches Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Manchester Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.
2R.* *Feb. 28*, 1113.

Manchester (Old Trafford) Foreign Animals Wharf
Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 139.

Manchester and Milford Railway Bil
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Manchuria
British Trade, Alleged Japanese Interference with, Date of Evacuation by Troops, etc.
Q. Mr. F. E. Smith; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Mar. 1*, 1291.

Margate Pier and Harbour Company
Report, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 96

Marine Insurance Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 706.
2R., *Mar. 1*, 1251.

Marine Works (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.

Marines, Royal
Officers, Training, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 28*, 1123.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Notts, Mansfield]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 604.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 604–606.

Marks, Mr. G. C. [Cornwall, Launceston]
Trade Marks Act, 1905, Fees under, *Feb. 26*, 785.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 866, 867
Customs and Excise—Procedure in -posing of Confiscated Goods, *Feb. 28*, 1118.
Foreign Seamen on British Ships, Proposals as to Prohibition of, *Feb. 21*, 344.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 866.
Pilotage Certificates granted to Foreigners—Number and Nationality of Holders etc., *Feb. 26*, 785.

Marlborough, Duke of
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 64.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Questions, *Feb. 26*, 750–757.
Self-Government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 748, 749.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister
Colonial Marriages, Importance of Legalising, in Great Britain.
Os. Lord Herschell, *Feb. 19*, 35, 36.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.

Marriages, Scotland
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.

Maryport Harbour Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Mason, Mr. J. F. [Windsor]
Militia Training, Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1288.

Match-box Industry
Order 81, Effect of.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1129.

Mauritius
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.
Telegraphic Communication with Réunion—Convention Presented, *Feb. 21*, 332; *Feb. 22*, 454.

Meat
Boneless—Regulations as to Inspection of Imports.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 20*, 213.
Prices—Effect of Restrictions on Importation of Cattle.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 27*, 1008-1110.

Medical Acts
Amendment, Proposals as to.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1129.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leix]
Customs and Excise—Promotions in Outdoor Department, *Feb. 26*, 769.
McNeale Estate Evictions, Alleged Police assistance at, *Feb. 21*, 350.

Members of Parliament
Payment of, Legislation to Authorise, Proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 26*, 773.
Postage, Free for, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Barnes, Mr. Keir-Hardie, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Belloc, Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1310, 1311.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]
Plural Voting Bill—Clause to deal with several Candidates standing for same Constituency, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Merchandise Marks Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 529.

Merchant Shipping
Collisions at Sea—Order in Council Amending Regulations, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 132.
Continuous Discharge Certificates, Objections to System of.
O. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 288, 289.
Cooks, Certification of, proposed.
O. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 288.
Food Scale, Enforcing Recommendations of Committee, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 287, 288.
Foreign Vessels in British Ports
Application of Statutory Requirements to—Legislative proposals.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26*, 783, 784.
Steerage Accommodation in.
Qs. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1309.
Legislative Measures
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Mr. Kearley, Sir. J. L. Walton, *Feb. 19*, 140; Mr. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 287.
"Ordovician," Loss of, Due to Employment of Foreign Seamen, alleged.
Q. Mr. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 21*, 344.
Qs. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 22*, 507, 508.
Seamen.
Deceased, Wages and Effects of—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 83, 137.
Foreign Seamen on British Ships.
Os. Mr. J. K. Hardie, *Feb. 19*, 195; Mr. J. H. Wilson, 289–292.
Qs. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 22*, 507, 508.
Legislation as to, Inclusion of, in Merchant Shipping Bill, proposed.
Os. Earl de la Warr, *Mar. 1*, 1256; Earl of Granard, 1257; Lord Tweedmouth, 1257.
Prohibition of, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 21*, 344.
Savings Banks etc.—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 20*, 210; *Feb. 22*, 456.
Stewards, Deductions from Wages of.
Os. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 27*, 1087.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Extension of, to Seamen, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 292

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 530.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 27*, 1028.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 96, 139.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Mersey Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Merthyr Tydvil Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 324.

Meteorology
Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 83, 120.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
c. 1R.* 325.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 325.

Metropolitan Police
See under Police.

Metropolitan Police [Dublin] Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 529.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 360.

Metropolitan Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 325.

Metropolitan Water Board Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 325.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Mexico
Geneva Convention, Accession to—Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 118.
Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70; *Feb. 22*, 454.

Michelham, Baron
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13*, 4.

Mid-Oxfordshire Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.

Middlesex County Council [General Powers] Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 325.

Midland Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.

Milford Docks Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Militia
Field Service Dress—Reason for Non-Supply of Cap.
Q. Mr. H. Beaumont; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 335.
Report of Director of Recruiting and Organisation, Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333; *Feb. 22*, 455.
Royal Irish Rifles, Training Arrangements for.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 28*, 1117.
Training Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Rawlinson, Mr. J. Mason Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1288, 1289.
Winter Training, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Burns, *Feb. 26*, 895.

Militia Act, 1882
Deputy Lieutenants, Qualifications of—Returns Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 125.

Millwall Dock Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.

Milner, Viscount
Africa South, Policy of the Government, Information as to, *Feb. 26*, 706.
Orange River Colony, Self-Government for. Postponement of Proposals as to, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 708–715.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 26*, 716–719.
Corporal Punishment, Alleged violation of Regulations as to *Feb. 27*, 930.
Political and Industrial Situation in, *Feb. 26*, 715, 716, 719.
Self-Government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 719–721.

Mines
Reports and Statistics, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 108, 109.
Wages of Miners, Deductions from—Amendment of Truck Acts, proposed.
Os. Mr. Fenwick, *Feb. 27*, 1087; Mr. H. Samuel, 1097; Mr. K. Hardie, 1104.

Mirfield Gas Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Mitchelstown
Estate of Countess of Kingston—Reinstatements of Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 768.
Labourers' Cottages, Rent of.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 798, 799.

Monaghan
  Local Government Board Order, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 125.

Monasterboice
  Elliott, J., Case of.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1141.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
  King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 650.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 654, 657.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
  Transvaal
    Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 981–984.
    Franchise, Conditions of, *Feb. 27*, 984, 985.
  Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.,—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose, E.]
  Administration, Local Self-Government, Extension of Principle of, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 845.
  Army
    Administration, Opinions of Lord Cromer, Lord Elgin, etc., Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 1388.
    Officers, Vacation of Appointment, Right of Residence during, *Feb. 27*, 1012.
  Bengal
    Education—Procedure in appointing Director of Public Instruction, *Mar. 1*, 1301, 1302.
    Partition of, Proposals as to, *Feb. 26*, 842–844.
      Local Feeling, State of, *Mar. 1*, 1302, 1303.
  Civil Service, Leave, Penalties for overstaying—Assimilating Civil and Military Regulations, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 493.
  Education of Coolie Children, Facilities for, *Feb. 22*, 503.
  inancial Condition, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1296.
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 812.
  Railways—Loishilman proposed Railway, Information as to, *Feb. 26*, 771.

Morocco
  Conference of European Powers at Algeciras
    References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 22.
      Os. Marquess of Northampton, 26; Marquess of Lansdowne, 38; Marquess of Ripon, 50; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 153; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 166.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
  Africa, East — Anglo-German Boundary Commission, Increase in Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1069.
  Crofters Holdings Amendment Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 20*, 276.
  Education Act Amendment Bill, introduction of, *Feb. 20*, 275.
  Feeble-Minded Commission, Vote for Expenses of, *Feb. 27*, 1053.
  Friendly Societies Registry, Increase in Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1036.
  International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1062; *Feb. 28*, 1208.
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 275.
  Land Commission, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1068.
  London Locomotive Commission—Vote for Travelling Expenses, *Feb. 27*, 1053; *Feb. 28*, 1202.
  Newfoundland Fisheries—Indemnity, Question of Defraying out of Imperial Funds, *Feb. 27*, 1074.
  Poor Law, Commission of Inquiry, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1053; *Feb. 28*, 1202.
  Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, Proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1196–1198.
  Redistribution Committee, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1038, 1039; *Feb. 28*, 1202.
  Samoa Arbitration Claims, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1075.
  South African War—Compensation Claim of General Botha, *Mar. 1*, 1285.
  Thames Estuary, Prevention of Pollution of, by Sewage Discharge, *Feb. 22*, 509.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 275.

Motions
  Ballot for—Sessional Order, *Feb. 20*, 217.

Motors
  Commission of Inquiry, Date of Presentin
  Report.
    Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Feb. 27*, 1037
    Mr. Burns, 1038.

Movine
Bowman, J., Compensation to, for Malicious Injury to cows, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1140.

Mull, Island of
Motor Car Traffic, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 89, 135.

Mullingar
Lunatic Asylum, Grant for.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce. *Mar.* 1, 1269.

Mullingar, Kells and Drogheda Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Kerry—Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *Mar. 1*, 1277.

Muscat
Award of Arbitration Tribunal Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76,119.

Museums
British Museum, *see that title*.
Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75,112.
Royal Scottish Museum—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82.

Musical Piracy
Proposals for Prevention of.
Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 21*, 343, 344.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]
Naval Dockyards
Discharges during 1905-6, *Mar. 1* 1292.
Grievances as to Wages, etc., *Mar 1*, 1371, 1372.

Natal
Disturbances in, Information as to.
O. Mr. J. K. Hardie, *Feb. 19*, 199.
Imperial Troops, Use of.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1288.
Native Crops, Damage done to, etc.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
Martial Law in, Date of Establishing, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 21*, 339.
Native Races, Protection of.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1240, 1241
Poll Tax, Information as to.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 21*, 339.

National Assurance Company of Ireland and Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill.
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702

National Debt
Military Savings Bank, *see* Army—Savings Bank.
Reduction of—Friendly Societies' and Trustee Saving's Banks—Accounts Presented, *Mar. 1*, 1250.

National Expenditure
See Revenue and Expenditure.

National Gallery
Directorship Vacancy, Proposals as to—
Q. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 1*, 1295.
Report 1905, ordered, *Feb. 20*, 212; Presented, *Feb. 21*, 333.

Natural History Museum
Account, Return and Statement ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Naval Prize Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 1251.

Naval Works Loans Bill
Abandonment of System, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1330; Mr. McCrae, 1343.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
Ammunition, Obsolete, Disposal of.
O. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 1*, 1343.
Appropriation Account and Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 122.
Armaments, Reductions in, Possibility of.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1334, 1335; Mr. A. Lee, 1340, 1341, 1344; Mr. McCrae, 1344; Mr. Bellairs, 1345.
"Assistance" Court-Martial—Procedure in conveying Minute to Officers and Press, Report made to Admiralty by Captain, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 22*, 496, 497.
"Britannia," Number of Men employed in building, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1006.
Contracts, Specifications, Alterations in, use of British materials, etc.
Qs. Mr. A. Lee, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 21*, 336.
Dockyards
Annual Accounts Presented, *Mar. 1*, 1259.
Deputations, Procedure as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1374, 1375; Mr. K. Hardie, 1375.

[cont.

Navy—*cont.*
Dockyards—*cont.*
Discharges during 1905-6.
Q. Mr. Napier ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1292.
Q. Mr. Jenkins ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1300.
Re-employment of Men, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Wilson ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27,* 1017.
Distribution of Work between Private and Government Dockyards.
Os. Mr. J. W. Benn, *Mar. 1,* 1358–1360.
Portsmouth, Alterations to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1327 ; Mr. A. Lee, 1338, 1382 ; Mr. J. Ward, 1382.
Wages and Conditions of Employment, Grievances as to, Payment of Union Rate, etc., proposed.
Os. Mr. Jenkins, *Mar. 1,* 1365–1370 ; Mr. Summerbell, 1370 ; Mr. Napier, 1371, 1372 ; Sir J. Baker, 1372, 1373 ; Mr. E. Robertson, 1373–1375 ; Mr. K. Hardie, 1375, 1376.
"Dreadnought," Men employed in building, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27,* 1006.
Efficiency of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 1,* 1341 ; Captain Hervey, 1352.
Engineer Officers, *see under subheading* Officers.
Expenditure
Europe and America—Statistics 1894–1905.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1334.
Reduction in.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1329, 1331 ; Mr. McCrae, 1342, 1343.
Statistics as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar 1,* 1329, 1330.
Works Acts, under, *see subheading* Works.
Flogging in.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Feb. 20,* 307 ; Mr. Tomkinson, 312 ; *Feb. 21,* 361 ; Mr. E. Robertson, 362, 370 ; Captain Hervey, 363 ; Mr. Lea, 365 ; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 368 ; Mr. H. Cox, 370 ; Mr. Dillon, 370 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 371 ; Mr. S. MacNeill, 372.
Mr. H. Cox ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1299, 1300.
Abolition of—Admiralty Circular.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 21,* 363 ; Mr. Everett, 363.

Navy—*cont*
Gunnery
Battle Practice—Report of Results Presented, *Feb. 19,* 81, 137.
Results of Tests with heavy Guns, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 112.
Hospital at Cape Town, Date of Completion of.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1,* 1376 ; Mr. Lambert, 1377.
Manœuvres, Merchant Vessels taking part in, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. E Robertson, *Feb. 28,* 1122.
Marines, *see that title.*
Obsolete ships, Elimination of.
Os. Captain Hervey, *Mar. 1,* 1354.
Officers
Education and Training of, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Mar. 1,* 1344–1351 ; Captain Hervey, 1356–1358 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1362–1365.
Q. Mr. Courthope ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 28,* 1123.
Interchangeability, Proposals as to
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Mar. 1,* 1345–1351 ; Captain Hervey, 1356–1358 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1362–1365.
Selborne Scheme.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Mar. 1,* 1345–1351.
Engineer Officers.
Active List, Return as to Shore Service Ordered, *Feb. 28,* 1248.
New Scheme of Training for.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Mar. 1,* 1346–1351 ; Captain Hervey, 1356–1358 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1362–1365.
Executive Officers (Active List) serving at the Admiralty—Return Ordered, *Feb. 28,* 1248.
Pay, Exceptions—List Presented, *Feb. 19,* 137.
Pensions, Conditions of holding—Order ir Council approving new Rule Presented, *Feb 19,* 85, 134.
Policy
Cawdor Memorandum, Carrying ou of.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1* 1328.
Q. Mr. Bellairs ; *A.* Mr. E Robertson, *Feb. 22,* 495 496.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Policy—*cont.*

Continuity of, Advantages of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 1*, 1337, 1342; Mr. Bellairs, 1351.

Statement of 30th November, 1905, Minority Report Quoted in, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1299.

Statement, 1906, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 112.

Rosyth Base, Expenditure on, Elimination of Estimate for.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1326; Mr. A. Lee, 1337, 1338, 1382.

Russo-Japanese War, Lessons of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 1*, 1340.

Sailors, Railway Passenger Regulations for, Provision of Special Accommodation, etc.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 22*, 495.

"Satellite" H.M.S.—Decision as to Retention on the Tyne.
Q. Mr. H. J. Craig; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1009, 1110.

Shipbuilding

Contracts for, Allocation of, between Private and Government Yards.
Os. Mr. J. W. Benn, *Mar. 1*, 1358–1360.

Designs, Secrecy with Regard to, Policy of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 1*, 1339.

Expenditure on, Statistics, 1895–1906.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1332, 1335; Sir H. Kimber, 1335.

Programme, 1906–7.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1327, 1339; Mr. A. Lee, 1338, 1339; Capt. Hervey, 1353.

Stokers, Promotion Regulations.
Os. Capt. Hervey, *Mar. 1*, 1357, 1358.

Stores, New Policy as to.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1331.

Strength of.
Os. Capt. Hervey, *Mar. 1*, 1353.

Submarine Mines, Defence of Ports by, *see under* Defence of the Empire.

Surgeons, Post-Graduate Courses for, Decision as to.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1*, 1377; *Mr.* Lambert, 1378.

Two-Power Standard.
Os. Capt. Hervey, *Mar. 1*, 1353.

Victualling Yards, Manufacturing Accounts Presented, *Mar 1*, 1259.

Navy—*cont.*

Works

Acts.

Expenditure under.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1329, 1330.

Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 122.

Borrowings for, Policy as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1330.

Loan Annuities, Sum Due for.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1333.

Works Loans Bill, *see* Naval Works Loans Bill.

Navy Estimates

Estimate and Statement (1906–7), Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 136.

Items Improperly placed on, alleged.
Os. Capt. Hervey, *Mar. 1*, 1355.

Motion to Report Progress [Mr. A. Chamberlain], *Mar. 1*, 1378–1381.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1*, 1379, 1380, 1383; Mr. A. Lee, 1379; Mr. Asquith, 1381.

Officers, Seamen, and Boys (129,000) *Com.*, *Mar. 1*, 1378.

Statement [Mr. E. Robertson], *Mar. 1*, 1325–1335.
Os. Mr. A. Lee *Mar. 1* 1335, 1336; Mr. Bellairs, 1344; Capt. Hervey, 1352; Mr. J. W. Benn, 1358.

Supplementary—Presented, *Feb. 26*, 703, 761.

Wages, etc.—£6,810,700, *Com.*, *Mar. 1*, 1378.

Works, Buildings, and Repairs — £1,954,500, *Com.*, *Mar. 1*, 1378.

Neagh, Lough

Drainage, Report of Sir A. R. Binnie, Presented, *Feb. 28*, 1114; *Mar. 1*, 1250.

Tabling, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 23*, 623.

Netherlands

Finances—Report Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Inland Navigable Waterways — Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 119.

Netherland Indies, Finances of—Report Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

New Forest

Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented *Feb. 19*, 88, 128.

New Hebrides
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 73, 117.

New Mills Urban District Council Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.
2R.* *Feb. 26*, 759.

Newark and District Light Railways
Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 455, 488.

Newcastle Chapter Act, 1884
Order in Council establishing Canonries, Presented, *Feb. 26*, 705, 762.

Newcastle Chapter Endowment Fund
Scheme for Transfer of, Presented, *Feb. 19*. 84, 134.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Newfoundland
Convention between France and United Kingdom—Arbitral Tribunal, Agreement as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 77, 118, 119.
Fisheries
Indemnity
Defraying out of Imperial Funds, Objections to.
Os. Mr. H. Cox, *Feb. 27*, 1069–1072; Sir E. Grey, 1072–1074; Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Morton, 1074.
Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1069; *Feb. 28*. 1200.

Newlands, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Feb. 14*, 14.

Newman Estate
O'Callaghan, T. C., Case of.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1145, 1146.

Newport Corporation Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Nicholls, Mr. G. [Northants, N.]
Army Clothing Contracts, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1016.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Acton—Site for Erection of Dust Destructor, *Feb. 26*, 770.
Cape Colony—Condition of Kaffirs employed in Kimberley Mines, *Feb. 28*, 1121.

Neild, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Telephone Service
Central Telephone Exchange, Complaints as to Working of, *Mar. 1*, 1261.
London Message Rate Subscription, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1261.

Nigeria
Children, Reason for alleged Sale of.
Q. Mr. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 497, 498.
Economic Products—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69, 117.
Punitive Expeditions, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1280.
Railway Construction—Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 117.
Reports, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.
Rising near Sokoto, Information as to.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1022.
Salt, Price of, Amount of Import Duty, etc.
Q. Mr. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 497, 498.
Southern Nigeria Protectorate Order in Council, Presented, *Feb. 26*, 706, 762.

Nile
See under Egypt.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
Canada—Appointment of Official British Commercial Representative, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 502.
Consular Reports, Proposals for Increasing Commercial Value of, *Feb. 22*, 504.
Ladies Gallery—Removal of Grille, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 520.
Postage Rates for Periodical Literature, *Mar. 1*, 1260.
Tibet Treaty—Progress of Negotiations with China, etc., *Feb. 22*, 503.
Wei-hai-Wei, *Status* of, and Proposals as to, *Feb. 22*, 505.

North East Lincolnshire Water Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.

North East London Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

North Metropolitan Tramways Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

North Sussex Gas and Water Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

North West London Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

North and South Shields Electric Railway Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 326.

Northcliffe, Lord
- Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 14.

Northampton, Marquess of
- Administration of Ireland—Devolution proposals, *Feb. 19*, 28.
- Anglo-Japanese Agreement, *Feb. 19*, 26.
- Denmark, King of, Death of, *Feb. 19*, 25.
- Greece, King of, Visit of to England, *Feb. 19*, 26.
- India, Visit of Prince and Princess of Wales to, *Feb. 19*, 25.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 25.
- Morocco, Conference of European Powers at Algeciras, *Feb. 19*, 26.
- Orange River Colony, Self-Government, Granting to, *Feb. 19*, 27.
- Plural Voting Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 19*, 30.
- Rates, Equalisation of, *Feb. 19*, 29.
- Religious Education in State Schools, *Feb. 19*, 28, 29.
- Transvaal:
  - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 27.
  - Self-Government, Granting to, *Feb. 19*, 27.

Norway
- Dissolution of Union with Sweden, Election of Prince and Princess Charles of Denmark as King and Queen.
  - *Os.* Lord Herschell, *Feb. 19*, 32; Marquess of Lansdowne, 39; Marquess of Ripon, 50.
  - References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 22.

Norwich
- Cavalry Barracks, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Arnold Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 26*, 773.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Notice of Accidents Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Feb. 27*, 1035.
- Memorandum, Explanatory, Ordered and Presented, *Feb. 27*, 1005.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Nunburnholme, Lord
- Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 15.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
- House of Commons, Seats, Procedure in Securing, by Members, *Feb. 22*, 510.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
- British Policy in Ireland, Changes in, *Feb. 20*, 239–247.
- Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 20*, 242–244.
- Ikerrin, Lord, Appointment of, as Inspector of Irish Produce sent to England, *Feb. 21*, 350; *Feb. 22*, 513.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 239.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department
  - Plunkett, Sir H., Tenure of Office by, *Feb. 21*, 352.
  - Porter, Mr., Salary, etc., of, *Feb. 21*, 351, 352; *Feb. 27*, 1014.
- Education, Rule 127B.
  - Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 352.
  - Opinions of Managers as to, *Mar. 2*, 1386.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
- Drainage, Arterial, Result of Inquiry into *Mar. 1*, 1262.
- Trinity College Estates—Commission Recommendations, Adoption of, *Mar. 1*, 1262.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
- Musical Piracy, Proposals for Prevention of, *Feb. 21*, 343.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
- Bengal, Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 835, 836; *Mar. 1*, 1302, 1303.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 834.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
- Land Commissioners, Complaints against Kerry County Council Resolution, *Feb. 26*, 797.
- Land Purchase in Congested Districts, Compulsory Purchase in, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 797.

O Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
- Armagheur Grazing Farm, Disposal of *Mar. 1*, 1270.
- Land Purchase, Refusals to Sell, by Land-Lords, Powers of Estates Commissioners to deal with, *Feb. 26*, 768.
- Local Government Board, Reconstitution of, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 518.

[*cont.*

O'Dowd, Mr. J.—*cont.*

Plunkett, Sir H.—Political Significance of Subscription to Mr. Bernard's Presentation, *Mar. 1*, 1271.

Sligo Conspiracy Trials, Composition of Jury at, *Feb. 21*, 357.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]

Guiana, British—Cause of Disturbances in Demerara, *Mar. 1*, 1279.

Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 21*, 399.

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 399.

O'Hara, Mr. P. [Monaghan, N.]

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department Inquiry, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1274.

Glasslough Disturbance, Information as to, *Feb. 26*, 771.

O'Hara-Trench Estate

Sale of, Petition from Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1267, 1268.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]

Constabulary—Period of Service of Mr. T. Lowndes, *Mar. 2*, 1389.

Petty Sessions Clerks, Papers set at Examinations of, *Mar. 2*, 1389.

Sligo Conspiracy Trials, Decision as to, *Feb. 21*, 356.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]

Keadue Telegraph Office, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1322.

Land Purchase, Compulsory Powers, Proposals as to Authorising, *Feb. 21*, 347.

Nigeria Punitive Expeditions, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1280.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]

Clifden Harbour Works, Delay in Commencing, *Feb. 26*, 765.

Seed Supply Bill, Proposals as to, *Feb. 28*, 1120.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Reason for Non-Employment of Mr. W. J. Byrne, *Feb. 26*, 799.

Army Horses destroyed during Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak, Compensation to Owners for, *Mar. 1*, 1287.

Dungarvan District Postal Facilities—Motor Service proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1294, 1295.

Motor Transport in Agricultural Districts, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1272.

Parker Estate, Purchase of, *Mar. 1*, 1272.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J.—*cont.*

Waterford

Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak, Claim in Connection with, *Mar. 1*, 1267.

Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *Mar. 1*, 1272.

Old Age Pensions

Colonial Systems, Circulating Information as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 776.

Opportunity for Discussion of.
O. Mr. Crooks, *Feb. 28*, 1151.

Scheme

Estimated cost of.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1147, 1148.

Necessity for Formulating.
Os. Mr. Barnes, *Feb. 20*, 261–265; Mr. P. Pease, 272; Mr. W. H. Lever, 279, 280; Mr. C. Wason, 284; Mr. Bottomley, 296, 297.

Sum Required to provide 5s. per Week for Persons over Sixty-five in United Kingdom.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 775.

Old Age Pensions Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 527.

Old Age Pensions (No. 2) Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 23*, 700.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

Onslow, Earl of

Chairman of Committees, Appointment as, *Feb. 19*, 66.

Orange River Colony

Colonial Probates Act, Order Applying, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 133.

Native Races, Protection of, under the New Constitution.
Os. Mr. Byles, *Feb. 28*, 1212–1214; Sir B. Gurdon, 1214–1216; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 1216–1224; Mr. Wedgwood, 1224–1226; Sir G. Parker, 1226–1231; Mr. Churchill, 1231–1244; Mr. Wyndham, 1244–1247.

Population, Statistics as to.
Qs. Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1021.

[*cont.*

Orange River Colony—*cont.*
Self-government for, Proposals as to.
Os. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 708.
Date of Bringing into Force.
Q. Mr. Brotherton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1125.
Franchise, Conditions of.
Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
Native Races, Protection of.
Os. Mr. Byles, *Feb. 28*, 1212–1214; Sir B. Gurdon, 1214–1216; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 1216–1224; Mr. Wedgwood, 1224–1226; Sir G. Parker, 1226–1231; Mr. Churchill, 1231–1244; Mr. Wyndham, 1244–1247.
Postponement of, proposed—Hostile Attitude of the Boers, etc.
Os. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 708–715; Earl of Elgin, 747, 748; Lord Burghclere, *Feb. 27*, 907; Viscount Halifax, 922.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 23.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, 27; Marquess of Ripon, 56.

"Ordovician"
Loss of, Due to Employment of Foreign Seamen, Alleged.
Q. Mr. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 21*, 344.
Qs. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 22*, 507, 508.

Outlawries Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 19*, 107.

Oxford, Bishop of
Took the Oath, *Feb. 14*, 15.

Oxford University
Statutes Amending Statutes Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 132.

Padstow, Bedruthan and Mawgan Light Railway (Extension of Time)
Order Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 114.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Africa, South—Native Races, Protection of, *Feb. 29*, 1226–1231.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 544.
Natal Disturbances—Use of Imperial troops, *Mar. 1*, 1288.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 544–553, 596.
Corporal Punishment, Allegations as to, *Mar. 1*, 1281.
Ordinance, Application of Amendment of, *Mar. 1*, 1281.

Parker Estate
Purchase of.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1272, 1273.

Parliament
Business of the House, *see that title.*
House of Commons
Arrangements of, Committee to consider, proposed.
Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Feb. 22*, 512.
Division *see under* Parliamentary Procedure.
Journal—Sessional Order, *Feb. 19*, 107.
Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms—Appointment of Committee, *Feb. 27*, 1076.
Ladies' Gallery—Removal of Grille, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Norman, Mr. Cremer Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 520.
Members, *see that title.*
Outer Lobby, Proposals as to Decorating Vacant Panels in.
Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Feb. 27*, 1007.
Post Office in Lobby, Enlargement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1312.
Sale of Bills Office, Situation of.
Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Feb. 22*, 511, 512.
Seats, Procedure in securing, by Members.
Os. Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. E. Wason, Sir W. B. Gurdon, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 22*, 510, 511.
Votes and Proceedings—Sessional Order, *Feb. 19*, 107.
Witnesses, Tampering with—Sessional Order, *Feb. 19*, 106.
House of Lords.
Bills, Introduction of, *see under* Bills.
Committees *see that title.*
New Peers introduced
Althorp, Viscount, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Atkinson, Lord *Feb. 13*, 3.
Birmingham, Bishop of, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Faber, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 14.
Fitzmaurice, Baron, *Feb 14*, 14.
Harmsworth, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 14.
Haversham, Lord, *Feb. 14* 15.
Hemphill, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 15.
[*cont.*

Parliament—*cont.*
House of Lords—*cont.*
New Peers introduced—*cont.*
Iveagh, Viscount, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Joicey, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 15.
Knaresborough, Baron, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Leith of Fyvie, Baron, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Liverpool, Earl of, *Feb. 13*, 2.
Loreburn, Baron, *Feb. 13*, 1.
Michelham, Baron, *Feb. 13*, 4.
Nunburnholme, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 15.
Plymouth, Earl of, *Feb. 13*, 3.
St. Aldwyn, Viscount, *Feb. 14*, 14.
Saunderson, Baron, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Waleran of Uffculme, Baron, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Weardale of Stanhope, Baron, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Winterstoke, Baron, *Feb. 14*, 15.
Representative Peers for Ireland—Right to Vote at Elections.
Ferrard, Viscount, *Mar, 1*, 1249.
Wicklow, Earl of, *Feb. 14*, 14.
Roll of the Lords, Presented, *Feb. 13*, 2; *Feb. 19*, 66.
Sat first
Cairns, Earl, after the death of his brother, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Cathcart, Earl, after the death of his father, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Camoys, Lord, after the death of his father, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Kinross, Lord, after the death of his father, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Leigh, Lord, after the death of his father, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord, after the death of his father, *Feb. 13*, 3.
Newlands, Lord, after the death of his father, *Feb. 14*, 14.
Scottish Peers' Representatives, Election of—Minutes of Meeting Presented, *Feb. 19*, 66.
Speaker Presented to, *Feb. 14*, 13.
Took the Oath, Bishop of Oxford, *Feb. 14*, 15.
Unionist Party, Policy of.
Os. Duke of Devonshire, *Feb. 22*, 461.
Houses of—Approaches, Sessional Order to Police as to, *Feb. 19*, 66, 106.

Parliaments, British & Foreign
Periods of Meeting etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 27*, 1016, 1017.

Parliamentary Constituencies
Electors, etc.—Return Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 110.

Parliamentary Elections
Bribery and Corruption—Sessional Order *Feb. 19*, 106.
Expenses and Machinery, etc.
Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 519, 520.
Legislation to authorise Payment of Expenses, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 26*, 773.
Franchise, granting to Women, proposed.
O. Mr. J. K. Hardie, *Feb. 19*, 198.
Ireland, Annoyance and Intimidation in—Police Efforts to preserve the Peace, etc.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1142.
Members returned for two or more places—Procedure, *Feb. 19*, 103.
New Members
Fuller, Mr. J. M. F., for Wiltshire (Western Division), *Feb. 27*, 1035.
Murray, Mr. James, for Eastern Division of County of Aberdeen, *Mar. 1*, 1325.
New Writs
Aberdeenshire, East, *Feb. 21*, 313.
Galway (North), *Feb. 20*, 312.
Hampshire (Northern Division), *Feb. 27*, 1003.
Kilkenny (North), *Feb. 20*, 206.
Leitrim (North), *Feb. 20*, 206.
London, City of, *Feb. 19*, 103.
Warrants, Appointment of Persons to issue, *Feb. 27*, 1112.
Wilts (Westbury Division), Objections to issue of New Writ.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*, 97–100; Sir J. L. Walton, 100; Sir E. Carson, 101; Mr. H. Gladstone, 101; Sir W. Robson, 102.
Peers, Interference of, at Elections.
Atkinson, Lord, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 19*, 103–105.
Sessional Order, *Feb. 19*, 103, 105.
Polling, Hours for, Inconvenience caused to Working Men, etc.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 21*, 343.

Parliamentary Elections (Disqualifications Removal) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 527.

Parliamentary Elections (Hours of Poll) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 528.

Parliamentary Electoral Areas—Redistribution Proposals
Commission of Inquiry, Constitution and Work of, Date of issuing Report, etc.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Feb. 27*, 1037, 1040, 1051; Mr. Burns, 1038, 1046–1048, 1051; Mr. Morton, 1038, 1039, 1045; Mr. Clancy, 1038, 1046; Mr. W. Rutherford, 1046; Mr. Long, 1048; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 1049; Sir H. Kimber, 1050; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1039, 1050; Mr. L. Jones, 1040, 1044; Mr. Byles, 1040; Mr. Vivian, 1041; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1042–1045; Mr. Whitley, 1044; Major Seely, 1044; Mr. Flynn, 1045; Mr. Dalziel, *Feb. 28*, 1200; Mr. Burns, 1200, 1201; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1201; Mr. Morton, 1202.

Report, Confidential Nature of, Payment of Expenses of Committee, etc.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas. Mr. Clancy; *As.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 26*, 787, 788.

Parliamentary Procedure
Questions, *see that title*.

Reform Proposals, etc.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *Feb. 28*, 1163, 1164; Mr. Pickersgill, 1165; Mr. S. Wortley, 1165–1167; Mr. Dalziel, 1167–1170; Mr. L. Hardy, 1170–1175; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1175–1178; Mr. MacNeill, 1178–1181; Sir C. Rasch, 1181–1183; Sir B. Gurdon, 1183; Sir J. Kennaway, 1184, 1185; Mr. Soames, 1185, 1186; Col. Sandys, 1186; Sir, F. Powell, 1188; Sir H. Fowler, 1189–1194; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, 1194, 1195; Sir H. Vincent, 1195, 1196; Mr. Morton, 1196–1198.
Qs. Mr. C. Grant, Sir J. Dickson Poynder; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 801.
Qs. Mr. S. Wilson, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 27*, 1034, 1035.

Blocking Motions, Policy of.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *Feb. 28*, 1178.

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
Reform Proposals, etc.—*cont.*

Deputy-Chairman, Alteration in *status* of, proposed.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Feb. 28*, 1174.

Dinner Hour, Abolition of, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 28*, 1160, 1161; Mr. S. Wortley, 1166; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1176; Mr. Morton, 1197.

Discussion of Scheme in the House, Opportunity for.
Os. Mr. Wyndham, *Feb. 28*, Mr. K. Hardie, 1163, 1164; Mr. Dalziel, 1169; Mr. A. Chamberlain, Col. Lockwood, 1193; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, 1194.

Divisions, Alterations in Method of Taking, proposed.
Os. Mr. Soames, *Feb. 28*, 1186; Sir H. Vincent, 1196.
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 519.

Government Scheme, Communicating Details of, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Feb. 28*, 1155, 1156; Mr. S. Evans, 1157; Mr. S. Wortley, 1166; Mr. Dalziel, 1168, 1169; Mr. L. Hardy, 1170; Sir H. Fowler, 1190; Sir H. Vincent, 1195.

Hours of Meeting and Adjourning, Changes in, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 28*, 1159; Mr. K. Hardie, 1164; Mr. L. Hardy, 1171; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1175; Mr. MacNeill, 1180, 1181; Col. Sandys, 1187; Sir H. Fowler, 1191; Sir H. Vincent, 1195; Mr. Morton, 1197.

Proceedings to be regarded as Confidential, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Wortley, *Feb. 28*, 1166.

Questions, Procedure as to.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *Feb. 28*, 1180; Sir F. Powell, 1188; Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1*, 1325.

Reports, Procedure as to.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1154; Mr. Wyndham, 1158; Mr. Pickersgill, 1165.

Scope of, and Terms of Reference.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1154; Mr. S. Wortley, 1166, 1167, 1192; Sir H. Fowler, 1192, 1193; Sir H. Vincent, 1195.

[*cont.*

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
Reform Proposals, etc.—*cont.*
Select Committee of Inquiry, Appointment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Feb.* *28*, 1152-1154; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1155, 1156; Mr. S. Evans, 1157; Mr. Wyndham, 1158; Mr. J. Redmond, 1158-1163.
Sittings of the House, Alteration in Dates of, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb.* *28*, 1161.
Speeches, Time Limit for, proposed.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *Feb. 28*, 1164; Sir C. Rasch, 1182, 1183; Mr. Morton, 1197, 1198.
Supply, Alteration in Procedure as to.
Os. Sir B. Gurdon, *Feb.* *28*, 1183, 1184; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, 1195.
Wednesday Short Sitting, Reverting to, proposed.
Os. Sir J. Kennaway, *Feb. 28*, 1184, 1185; Sir F. Powell, 1188; Sir H. Vincent, 1196; Mr. Morton, 1198.

Parliamentary Voters (Registration) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 2*, 1454.

Paul, Mr. H. W. [Northampton]
Africa, South, Policy of the Unionist Government in, *Feb. 19*, 201, 202.
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 2*, 1393.
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 19*, 202-204.
International Exhibitions, Contributions to, Lack of Control over, *Feb. 27*, 1062; *Feb. 28*, 1205-1207.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 201.
Milan Exhibition, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1056; *Feb. 28*, 1205.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 201; *Feb. 22*, 619.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Education Bill, Proposals as to, *Feb. 22*, 523.
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 272.
Food and Drink, Taxation of—Revision of System proposed, *Feb. 26*, 763.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 271.
Old Age Pensions, Necessity for Dealing with Question, *Feb. 20*, 272.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 273.

Penal Servitude Acts (1853-1891)
Conditional Licences granted, *Feb.* *19*, 87, 129, 136.

Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Pentonville Prison
Governor—Salary of Major O. Davies, etc.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 26*, 779.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Congo Free State Administration—Commission Report, Date of issuing, *Feb. 21*, 342.
Foreign Office Questions, Proposals as to answering, Rule as to Supplementary Questions, etc., *Feb. 21*, 340, 341; *Feb. 26*, 802, 803.
India
Bengal, Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 847-851.
Local Self-Government, Extension of Principle of, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 849, 850.
King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 634, 657, 671; *Feb. 26*, 847.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb.* *23* 634, 640, 642, 644, 647, 649, 657.
Labour Recruitment in British Central Africa, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
Self-Government, Publishing Papers shewing Local Demand for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1281.

Persia
Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69, 70.

Peru
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

Peterborough Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

Peterhead
Harbour Works—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.

Petersfield
Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented *Feb. 19*, 88, 128, 129.

Pharmacy Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 28*, 1151.

Pharmacy (Ireland) Acts, 1875-1890
Orders in Council, Presented, *Feb.* *19*, 89, 125, 126.

Philippine Islands
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Criminal Law Procedure, Legislative Proposals for amending, *Mar. 1*, 1291.
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1165.

Pickle Point Pier
Rules, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 127.

Picric Acid
Explosives Act, 1875—Order in Council, Presented, *Feb. 26*, 705, 762.

Piers and Harbours
Harbours Bills—Report ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Ireland

Clifden Harbour Works, Delay in commencing.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce *Feb. 26*, 765.

Pickle Point Pier—Rules, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 94, 127.

Keyham Harbour Works, Granite used in.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. L. Jones, Mr. C. Devlin, Mr. Pirie, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 1*, 1300, 1301.

Ramsgate Harbour—Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91, 138.

Report by Board of Trade, Presented, *Feb. 27*, 905, 1005.

Scotland—Report on Peterhead Works, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.

Pilotage Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 526.

Pilots and Pilotage
Alien Pilots, Proposed Legislation as to.
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1293.
Qs. Mr. Beckett, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1306, 1307.

Foreigners, Certificates granted to—Number and Nationality, etc.
Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Feb. 26*, 785.

Port Talbot Bye-laws, Order approving, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 133.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Aberdeen Granite, Merits of, *Mar. 1*, 1301.

Church Rates in Scotland, Abolition of, *Mar. 1*, 1319, 1320.

Members of Parliament, Free Postage for, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1311.

Places of Worship (Sites) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 805.

Plunkett, Sir H.
See under Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.

Plural Voting Bill
Clause as to three or more Candidates standing for same Constituency, Introduction of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Introduction of

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19*, 30.

Plymouth
Firing Practice from Forts, Annoyance caused by.
Q. Mr. Dobson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1286.

Plymouth, Earl of
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13*, 3.

Police
Metropolitan

Day of Rest, Regulation as to.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27*, 1011.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1127, 1128.

Foreign Languages, Facilities given for learning.
Qs. Mr. C. Hay; *As.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Mar. 1*, 1304, 1305.

Report (1904) Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 109.

Passive Resisters' Goods, Legality of Charge for storing.
Q. Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 27*, 1025.

Police and Sanitary Committee
Appointment of—Resolution (Mr. H. Samuel), *Feb. 26*, 759.

Police (Superannuation) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 27*, 1035.

Pollard, Dr. G. H. [Lancashire, S. E. Eccles.]
Poor Law Medical Officers, Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 1387.

Polling Districts
For particular places see their Names.

Alterations in—Orders Presented, *Feb. 19*, 88, 127, 128.

Pontefract Corporation Bill
c 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.
2R.* *Feb. 27*, 1004.

Poor Law
Able-Bodied Paupers, Number relieved by Local Authorities other than Guardians.
O. Mr. Burns, *Feb. 26*, 889.

[*cont.*

Poor Law—*cont.*

Commission of Inquiry

Constitution of.
Os. Mr. Wilkie, *Feb. 28,* 1202–1205.

Vote for, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Feb. 27,* 1053; Mr. McKenna, 1054; Mr. Morton, *Feb. 28,* 1202; Mr. Wilkie, 1202.

Commissioners—Report (1834) Presented, *Feb. 19,* 76, 116.

Guardians, Magisterial Qualifications of—Case of H. and C. Blythe.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1026.

Ireland

Commission Report, Date of Issue of.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 2,* 1388, 1389.

Number of Paupers in, Increase of.
O. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19,* 184.

Medical Officers, Return as to, proposed.
Q. Dr. Pollard; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Mar. 2,* 1387.

Pauperism

Cost of Relief, etc.—Statement Presented, *Feb. 19,* 83, 131.

Monthly Statements, Ordered, *Feb. 28,* 1115; Presented, *Mar. 1,* 1259.

Relief

Cost of maintaining Aged Poor by, etc.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 27,* 1011.

Persons over age of 65 in Receipt of, etc.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Mar. 1,* 1313, 1314.

Port Talbot

Pilotage Bye-laws, Order approving, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 84, 133.

Portsmouth

Dockyard—Alterations to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 1,* 1327; Mr. A. Lee, 1338, 1382; Mr. J. Ward, 1382.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under-Secretary for War*

Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27,* 925–933.

Portsmouth Water Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Portugal

Parcels Post—Agreement Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 118.

Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69, 70.

Postmaster-General

Right Hon. S. Buxton.

Post Office

Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.

Cleator Moor District Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Fullerton; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 27,* 1028.

Grievances of Employees, Inquiry into

Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Henderson; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 20,* 216.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 22,* 492.

Scope of.
Q. Mr. Henderson; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26,* 787.

Terms of Reference of Select Committee.
Q. Mr. J. Chamberlain; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 21,* 359.

Witnesses, Selection of.
Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1293.

Inland Post—Amended Warrant, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 92, 136.

Ireland

Dungarvan District, Motor Service in, proposed.
Qs. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1294, 1295.

Postal Service to England, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 21,* 358, 359.

Wexford—Charge for Private Bags.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1322.

Margravine Road, Postal District of.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1260.

Money Order—Convention with France—Additional Agreement, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 82, 137.

Parcels Post

Agreement with Portugal, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 118.

Foreign and Colonial—Amended Warrants, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 91, 136.

Weight, Increase in Maximum, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 28,* 1131.

Postage

Blind, Literature for.
Q. Lord Valentia; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1311, 1312.

Members of Parliament, Free Postage for, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Barnes, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Belloc, Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1310, 1311.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Postage—*cont.*

Periodical Literature, Rates for.
Qs. Mr. Norman; *As.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1260, 1261.

Postal Orders

Colonial Amendment (No. 6) Regulations, Presented, *Feb. 28,* 1113; *Mar. 1,* 1250.

Inland—Regulations, Presented, *Feb. 28,* 1113; *Mar. 1,* 1250.

Wages

Bradford Commission Recommendations, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26,* 787.

Inquiry, etc., *see subheading* Grievances of Employees.

Western District Office, Messengers' Overtime Pay in.
Q. Mr. Burdett-Coutts; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1312.

Withington Postmen, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1313.

Post Office Savings Bank

Investments—Regulations, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 92, 123.

Postal Orders

See under Post Office.

Potteries

Wages, Deductions from—Amendment of Truck Acts, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Feb. 27,* 1080.

Powell, Sir F. S, [Wigan]

Grand Committees, Work of, *Feb. 28,* 1189.

Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1188, 1189.

President of the Board of Agriculture

Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education

Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

President of the Board of Trade

Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board

Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Preston, Chorley and Horwich Tramways Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Prevention of Corruption Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 706.
2R. *Mar. 1,* 1253.

Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Vivian; *A.* Sir L. Walton, *Mar. 1,* 1319.

Price, Mr. H. N., Case of

Police Conduct in Arrest and Detention of Mr. Price, Question of Perjury, etc.
Q. Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 28,* 1128.

Printing

See Stationery and Printing.

Prisons

Convict—Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 74, 109.

International Penitentiary Congress at Buda Pesth—Report Presented, *Feb. 22,* 455, 487.

Limerick Female Prison, Order closing Presented, *Feb. 19,* 89, 126.

Military, *see* Army—Prisons.

Pentonville—Governor's Salary, etc.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 26,* 779.

Prisoners—Measuring and Photographing Regulations, Application of, to Aliens, Presented, *Feb. 23,* 621; *Feb. 26,* 704.

Scotland

Glasgow, Duke Street—Rule as to Visiting Committee, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 93, 134.

Term of Office of Visiting Committee and holding of First Meeting—Rule as to, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 1386.

Soldiers in Civil Prisons, Nature of Offences, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 27,* 1018.

Priston Light Railway

Order Presented, *Feb. 19,* 71, 114.

Private Bills

See Bills—Private.

Prize Courts Bill

l. 1R.* *Mar. 1,* 1251.

Public Accounts Committee

Nomination of, *Feb. 22,* 620.

Report, Opportunity for considering.
Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Mar. 1,* 1298, 1299.

Public Health Acts [Amendment] Bill

l. 1R.* *Mar. 1,* 1250.

Public Offices (Acquisition of Sites) Acts

Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19,* 121.

Public Offices Site (Dublin) Act, 1903
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 121.

Public Petitions Committee
Nomination of Members, *Mar. 1*, 1384.

Public Trustee and Executor Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 32*, 529.

Pure Beer Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 525.

Quarries
Reports and Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 108, 109.

Queen Anne's Bounty
Report and Accounts Presented, *Feb. 26*, 703, 760.

Queen's Colleges
See Names of Places as Belfast, *etc.*

Questions
Foreign Office
Proposals as to Answering during Absence of Secretary.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Earl Percy, Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 340, 341.
Qs. Mr. J. Chamberlain; Mr. Runciman, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 504.
Supplementary Questions, Rule as to.
Os. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Earl Percy, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Dillon, *Feb. 21*, 340, 341.
Form of—Rule as to Naming Members.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 28*, 1141, 1142.
Imputations against Members, Rule as to.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1141–1143.
Irrelevant, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1320.
Order of—Questions left Unanswered at Three o'Clock, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Mar. 1*, 1324; Mr. Asquith, 1325.
Statements cannot be made during time for, *Mar. 1*, 1301.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
Police Action in Arrest of Mr. H. N. Price, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1128.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Railway Tickets Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 2*, 1454.

Railways
Accidents
Returns, and Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 82, 115.
Servants, to, *see* sub-heading Servants.
Automatic Brakes, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. H. J. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26*, 784.
Bills—Report Ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114—Presented, *Mar. 2*, 1386.
Ireland—Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77.
Light—Orders as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 71, 113.
Sailors, Passenger Regulations for, Provision of Special Accommodation, etc.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 22*, 495.
Scotland
Highland Society's Show, Facilities in Connection with.
Q. Lord Dalmeny; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Feb. 28*, 1133.
West Highland Railway, Extension to Mallaig—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91, 138.
Servants
Accidents—Coupling, etc., and use of Shunting Poles.
Qs. Mr. Bell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26*, 784.
Hours of Labour, Returns Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 115.
Wages of Employees, Fines and Deduction from, Operation of Suspension System, etc.
Os. Mr. Bell, *Feb. 27*, 1084, 1098; Mr. H. Samuel, 1098.

Ramsgate Harbour
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19*, 91, 138.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Chelmsford]
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1181–1183.
Sailors, Railway Passenger Regulations for, Provision of Special Accommodation, etc., *Feb. 22*, 495.

Rathmines and Rathgar
Mortuary, Provision of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26*, 772.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 327.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
Militia—Training Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1288.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
  Food Supply in Time of War—Proposals as to National Indemnity Committee, *Feb. 21*, 335.

Redistribution Proposals
  See Parliamentary Electoral Areas, Redistribution of.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Administration of Ireland—Cost of, *Feb. 19*, 185.
  Belfast—Queen's College Endowment Proposals, *Mar. 1*, 1316.
  Crimes Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 19*, 189, 190.
  Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1446.
  Emigration from Ireland, Statistics as to, *Feb. 19*, 182, 183.
  Grand Committees, Delegation of Work to, Failure of Experiment, *Feb. 28*, 1161, 1162.
  Home Rule for Ireland, Question of, *Feb. 19*, 180–182, 187, 190–193.
  Irish Language—Teaching in Schools, Proposals as to, *Feb. 22*, 516.
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 180.
  Land Purchase—Legislative proposals, Absence of, *Feb. 19*, 188, 189.
  Lunacy in Ireland, Increase of, *Feb. 19*, 183.
  Population of Ireland, Decline in, *Feb. 19*, 182, 183.
  Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1158–1163.
  Questions
    Charge against Member by Name, Responsibility for circulating Question containing, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1142, 1143.
    Unanswered, Exclusion of Irish Questions, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1324.
  Sligo Conspiracy Trials, Jurors challenged at, *Feb. 21*, 356.
  Taxation of Ireland, *Feb. 19*, 185, 186.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
  Clare Land Commission Sittings, *Feb. 27*, 1029.
  Granite, Irish, Merits of, *Mar. 1*, 1301.
  Home Rule—Resolution received from Australian Parliaments, *Feb. 27*, 1018.
  Old Age Pensions—Circulating Information as to, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 776.
  "Planter," Definition of, *Feb. 28*, 1141.
  Tobacco Cultivation—Extension of Time for Rebate, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1146.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
  India
    Administration—Extension of powers of local self-government, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 833, 834.
    Bengal, Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 831–833.
  King's Speech, Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 831.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
  Day Industrial Schools—Amended Order as to Application of Act, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 84, 133.
  Great Britain—Report (1904), Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 109.
  Ireland—Report of Inspector, Presented *Feb. 19*, 72, 111.
  Scotland—Transfer of Powers, Order as to, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 90, 130.

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 526.

Religious and Philanthropic Institutions
  Inspection of Industrial Establishments under the Factories Act.
    Qs. Mr. Money, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 28*, 1126, 1127.
  Laundries, *see that title.*

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
  Police, Metropolitan—Regulations as to Day of Rest, *Feb. 28*, 1127.

Réunion
  Telegraphic Communication with Mauritius—Convention Presented, *Feb. 21*, 332; *Feb. 22*, 454.
  Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69.

Revenue and Expenditure
  Increase in Expenditure
    References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 23.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
  Defence of Ports by Submarine Mines, Decision as to, *Feb. 26*, 774.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal.*
  Administration of Ireland—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 57.
  Agricultural Districts—Depopulation of, *Feb. 19*, 58.
  Anglo-Japanese Agreement, *Feb. 19*, 49.
  Bills, Date of Introduction of, Inadequate Time for Discussion, etc., *Feb. 19*, 59.
  Crimes (Ireland) Act, Withdrawal of, *Feb. 19*, 58.
  Denmark, King of, Death of, *Feb. 19*, 48.
  Education—Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 19*, 59.

Ripon, Marquess of—*cont.*
- India
    - Army, Administrative Schemes, *Feb. 19*, 51.
    - Visit of Prince and Princess of Wales to, *Feb. 19*, 49.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 47.
- Macedonian Question, Settlement of, *Feb. 19*, 50, 51.
- Morocco—Conference of European Powers, *Feb. 19*, 50.
- Norway and Sweden, Dissolution of Union between, *Feb. 19*, 50.
- Orange River Colony, Self-government for, *Feb. 19*, 56.
- Russo-Japanese War, Termination of, *Feb. 19*, 49.
- Transvaal
    - Chinese Labour question, *Feb. 19*, 51–54.
    - Self-government, Proposals as to, *Feb. 19*, 54–56.

Roads
- Maintenance of, out of Imperial Funds, proposed.
    - *Os.* Colonel Lockwood, *Feb. 26*, 902; Mr. Asquith, 903.

Roberts, Earl
- Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Proposals as to granting Self-government to, *Feb. 27*, 914–917.

Roberts, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
- Liquor Licensing Statistics, Return as to proposed, *Feb. 27*, 1023.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 883.
- Unemployed, Method of dealing with, *Feb. 26*, 884–886.

Roberts, Mr. J. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
- Africa, South—Attack on Government Policy, by Col. W. T. W. Davies, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1124, 1125.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 269.
- Transvaal
    - Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 269, 270.
    - Self-government for, Proposals as to, *Feb. 20*, 270.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
- Hammersmith Exhibition—Conditions of leasing Land, etc., *Feb. 26*, 789.
- India
    - Administration of, further Powers of Self-government proposed, *Feb. 26*, 816–818.
    - Bengal—Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 811–815.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 811.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour
    - Arrivals of Shiploads of Coolies, Information as to, *Feb. 22*, 499.
    - Regulations, revised, Tabling proposed, *Feb. 22*, 499.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
- "Assistance" Court Martial—Procedure in conveying Minute to Officers and Press, etc., *Feb. 22*, 497.
- "Britannia," Men employed in building, *Feb. 27*, 1006.
- Cawdor's, Lord, Memorandum of 30th November, 1905, Decision as to, *Feb. 22*, 496; *Mar. 1*, 1328.
    - Reports quoted in, *Mar. 1*, 1299.
- Contracts—Alterations in Specifications, *Feb. 21*, 336; *Feb. 22*, 497.
- Dockyards
    - Deputations—Procedure as to, *Mar. 1*, 1374, 1375.
    - Discharges
        - Number during 1905–6, *Mar. 1*, 1292.
        - Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1300.
        - Re-employment of Men, *Feb. 27*, 1017.
    - Portsmouth, Alterations to, *Mar. 1*, 1327.
    - Wages, and conditions of Employment, Grievances as to, *Mar. 1*, 1373–1375.
- "Dreadnought," Men employed in building, *Feb. 27*, 1006.
- Estimates
    - Motion to Report Progress, *Mar. 1*, 1379, 1380, 1383.
    - Statement, *Mar. 1*, 1325–1335.
- Expenditure
    - Decrease in, *Mar. 1*, 1329.
    - Europe and America—Statistics 1894–1905.
    - Statistics, 1895–1906, *Mar. 1*, 1332, 1335.
    - Works Acts, under, *Mar. 1*, 1329, 1330.
- Flogging
    - Abolition of—Admiralty Circular, *Feb. 21*, 362, 363, 370.
    - Regulations, *Mar. 1*, 1300.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 362.
- Manœuvres, Merchant Vessels taking part in, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1122.
- Rosyth Base, Elimination of Estimate for, *Mar. 1*, 1326.
- Sailors, Railway Passenger Regulations for, Provision of Special Accommodation, etc., *Feb. 22*, 495.

[*cont.*

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
"Satellite"—Decision as to retention on the Tyne, *Feb. 27,* 1010.
Shipbuilding
Expenditure on—Statistics, 1895-1906; *Mar. 1,* 1332.
Programme, 1906-7, *Mar. 1,* 1327.
Stores, New Policy as to, *Mar. 1,* 1331.
Submarine Mines, Decision as to defence of Ports by, etc., *Feb. 26,* 774.
Works Loans Bills, Policy as to, *Mar. 1,* 1330.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
Africa, South—Native Races, Protection of, under the new Constitution, *Feb. 28,* 1216-1224.
Aliens—Rejections in British Ports in 1906, *Mar. 1,* 1295.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*Solicitor-General* [South Shields]
Westbury Division of Wilts, Objections to issue of New Writ for, *Feb. 19,* 102.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Comyn Kenny Estate, Purchase of, *Feb. 27,* 1031.
Constabulary—Enlistments during 1905-6, *Mar. 1,* 1277.
O'Hara Trench Estate, Sale of, etc., *Mar. 1,* 1267.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 328.

Romford
Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 88, 128.

Rosnalee
Evicted Tenants on Mr. Leader's Estate Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 796.

Rosyth Naval Base
See under Navy.

Rotherhithe
Dockhead Post Office—Reason for discontinuing delivery of Telegrams.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 2,* 1387.

Roumania
Customs Tariff, new—Translation Presented, *Feb. 19,* 82; *Feb. 26,* 703, 762.
Treaty with—Despatch Presented, *Feb. 19,* 80, 119.

Royal Canal
Condition of, Scarcity of Boats, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 22,* 493, 494.

Rugby Subordinate School Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Runciman, Mr. W., *Parliamentary Secretary Local Government Board* [Dewsbury]
Congo Free State Administration—Right of Intervention by European Powers, etc., *Feb. 21,* 342.
Foreign Office Questions, Answering, during absence of Secretary, *Feb. 22,* 504.
Soudan Frontier, Alleged Attacks by Congo Troops on, *Feb. 21,* 341.
Tibet Treaty—Progress of Negotiations with China, etc., *Feb. 22,* 503.
Trade, Reports, Consular, Proposals for increasing Commercial Value of, *Feb. 22,* 505.
Wei-hai-Wei, *Status of* and proposals as to, *Feb. 22,* 505.

Russell, Earl
Marine Insurance Bill, 2R., *Mar. 1,* 1252.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Salary of Mr. Porter, *Feb. 21,* 352.
Crimes and Outrages in the North of Ireland, *Feb. 21,* 403-405.
Cross—Damage to Property of Mr. R. Bailey, Police Efforts to discover Offenders, etc, *Feb. 22,* 516.
Desertmartin, Disturbances at, Police Protection of District, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1032.
Dublin, North, Union Workhouse, Infantile Mortality in, *Feb. 22,* 517.
Grand Committees, Work of, *Feb. 28,* 1177.
Home Rule Question—Devolution Proposals of the Government, *Feb. 21,* 402-407.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21,* 402.
Land Commission, Vote for, *Feb. 27,* 1066.
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1175-1178.
Redistribution Committee, Information as to, *Feb. 27,* 1039, 1050.

Russia
Customs Tariff, New, Effect of.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Feb. 20,* 256.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26,* 781.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28,* 1118.
Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Russo-Japanese War
Hamilton, General Sir I., Book of—War Office Permission to Publish, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 27*, 1017.
Termination of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 21.
Os. Lord Herschell, 31; Marquess of Ripon, 49.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Army Courts Martial—Press Admission to Trial of Staff-Sergeant-Major Hilton, *Feb. 22*, 494.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
London Locomotion Commission—Vote for Travelling Expenses, *Feb. 27*, 1052.
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1046.
Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill, 2R., *Feb. 27*, 1110.

Ryhope, Seaham, Murton and South Hetton Light Railways
Order Presented, *Feb. 22*, 455, 489.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 14.

St. Andrew's
University—Ordinance of Court, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 135.

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 328.

St. Louis Exhibition
See under United States of America.

St. Mary Charterhouse
Union of Benefice with St. Thomas—Scheme Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 139.

St. Mary's Marshes
Explosion at—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 73, 108.

St. Michael, Cornhill
Union of Benefice with St. Peter le Poor, etc.—Scheme Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 139.

St. Pancras Electricity Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 328.

St. Peter le Poor
Union of Benefice with St. Michael, Cornhill—Scheme Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 139.

St. Thomas Charterhouse
Union of Benefice with St. Mary—Scheme Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 139.

St. Vincent
Prison—Rules Presented, *Feb. 19*, 131; *Feb. 22*, 455.
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Sale of Coke Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 804.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 530.

Sale of Whisky Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 28*, 1152.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Administration of Ireland—Devolution proposals, *Feb. 19*, 61.
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 19*, 62, 63, 65.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 19*, 61, 65.

Samoa
War of 1899 in—British Claims for Damages, Vote for, *Feb. 27*, 1075; *Feb. 28*, 1200.
Os. Mr. Morton, Sir E. Grey, *Feb. 27*, 1075.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1093.

Samuel, Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Aliens—Immigration Board Proceedings, Press Admission to, *Feb. 27*, 1025.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1186-1188.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Customs and Excise—Confiscated Goods, Rule as to Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 1295, 1296.
India, Information as to Financial Condition, *Mar. 1*, 1296.

"Satellite," H.M.S.
Decision as to Retaining on the Tyne.
Q. Mr. H. J. Craig; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1009, 1110.

Saunderson, Baron
Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 13* 3.

Saunderson, Col. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Condition of Ireland, Financial Prosperity, etc., *Feb. 21*, 375, 376.
Home Rule for Ireland, Question of—Devolution Proposals of the Government, *Feb. 21*, 372–379.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 372.
Louth Parliamentary Election Campaign *Feb. 21*, 377, 378.

Savings Banks
See also Post Office Savings Bank, Trustee Savings Bank, etc., *and for* Military Savings Bank *see under* Army.
National Debt Account Presented, *Feb. 38*, 1114.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Ceylon—Elementary Education Question. *Feb. 22*, 502.
County Court Stationery, etc., Contracts, *Mar. 1*, 1317,
German New Customs Tariff, Effect of, *Feb. 21*, 345.
India—Education of Coolie Children, *Feb. 22*, 503.
Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill, 2R., *Feb. 27*, 1109, 1110.
Withington Postmen, Pay of, *Mar. 1*, 1313.

Science, &c., Royal College of
Departmental Committee Report on College of Science and School of Mines, Decision as to.
Qs. Sir W. Collins, Sir P. Magnus; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Feb. 26*, 788, 789.
Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 112.
Report Presented, *Feb. 27*, 905, 1005.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
Births, Marriages, and Deaths—Report etc., Presented, *Feb. 19*, 79, 116.
Church Rates, Abolition of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, Mr. E. Wason; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 1*, 1319, 1320.
Crofters and Cottars, Land for—Policy of Congested Districts Board.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Feb. 20*, 276, 277; Mr. C. Wason, 286.
Highland Society's Show, Railway Facilities in connection with.
Q. Lord Dalmeny; *A.* Sir E. E. Strachey, *Feb. 28*, 1133.
Houses in, Letting of, Amendment of Law as to, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. Cross, *Feb. 20*, 302–305; Mr. Findlay, Mr. T. Shaw, 305; Mr. Duncan, 306.

Scotland—*cont.*
Housing of the Working Classes Act, Application of.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Mar. 1*, 1320, 1321.
Judicial Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19*, 78, 116.
Royal Scottish Museum—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 134.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
Training Colleges—Revision of Regulations for Admission, etc., *Feb. 28*, 119.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Volunteer Uniforms—Responsibility for Contracts, *Feb. 21*, 336, 337.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Right Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Right Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Right Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Right Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancashire, S.W., Newton]
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships Involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1089.

Seed Supply Bill
Proposals as to
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1120.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 225; *Feb. 22*, 580.
Redistribution Committee, Information as to, *Feb. 27*, 1044.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 225–230; *Feb. 22*, 580–583, 617.

Selborne, Lord
See under Africa, South.

Select Vestries Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 19*, 24.

Servia
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Seychelles
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 603.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 603.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1083.

Shannon, River
Fisheries—Return as to Revenue, etc., proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 26*, 766.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T., *Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
Houses in Scotland, Letting of, Amendment of law as to, proposed, *Feb. 20*, 305.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
Labourers' Cottages Schemes, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 1278.

Sheffield Assay Office Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Sheffield District Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Shop Hours Act, 1904
Hours of Closing Shops, Orders as to, Made by Councils, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 86, 87, 125, 127, 134; *Feb. 20*, 205, 210; *Feb. 23*, 621, ; *Feb. 26*, 704, 762.

Shops
Wages of Employees, Deductions from' Evils of Living-in System, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Feb. 27*, 1082; Mr. Seddon, 1089; Mr. H. Samuel, 1096; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 1107.

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 328.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Siam
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Sierra Leone
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Sinclair, Rt.Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Church Rates, Abolition of, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 1320.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont*
Crinan Canal, Report on Condition of, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 489.
Fisheries Board, Constitution of, *Feb. 26*, 792.
Housing of the Working Classes Act, Application of, *Mar. 1*, 1321.
Local Taxation Inquiry, Result of, *Feb. 26*, 791.
Teachers, Training of—Effect of Provisions of Draft Regulations, *Feb. 26*, 792.
Trawling, Illegal, in Firth of Forth, Prohibition of, *Feb. 26*, 791.

Sligo
County Council Printing Contract—Reason for Accepting Mrs. McHugh's Tender, etc.
Qs. Mr. Liddell, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Farrell, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1139, 1140.
Conspiracy Trials
Decision as to Second Trial, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. C. O'Kelly, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Cherry, Mr. Speaker, *Feb. 21*, 356, 357.
Jury Packing at, alleged.
Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Mar. 1*, 1321, 1322.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Armagh Urban District Council Refusal to Grant Site for Monument, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1031.
Ballacolla Post Office, Situation of, *Feb. 26*, 801.
Factory Inspectors—Proposals as to Woman Inspector for Ireland, *Feb. 28*, 1127.
Home Rule, Question of—Devolution Proposals, *Feb. 21*, 396–399.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 21*, 396.
Laundries in Religious Institutions, Inspection of, *Feb. 22*, 507.
Religious and Philanthropic Institutions—Legislative Proposals as to Inspection, *Feb. 28*, 1127.

Small Holdings Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 23*, 699.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire.]
India
Administration of—Extension of Powers of Local Self-Government, proposed, *Feb. 26*, 839–841.
Bengal, Partition of, *Feb. 26*, 838.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 838.

Smith, F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
Manchuria, British Trade in, Date of Evacuation by Japanese Troops, etc., *Mar. 1,* 1291.

Smythe, Col., Estate of
Sale of
Reason for Delay, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 20,* 214, 215.
Rent Recovery Proceedings, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 26,* 764, 765.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]
Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1185, 1186.

Society Islands
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Solar Physics Committee
Report Presented, *Feb. 27,* 905, 1005.

Solicitor-General
Sir W. S. Robson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

Solomon Islands, British
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 68, 116.

Somaliland
Game Preservation in.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1297, 1298.
Order in Council Presented, *Feb. 19,* 85, 133.
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 68, 116.

Soudan
Frontier, Alleged Attacks by Congo Troops on, etc.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Feb. 21,* 341.

South African War
Compensation Claim of General Botha.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1285.
Stores and Supplies
Commission of Inquiry, Work of, Date of Issuing Report, etc.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Feb. 27,* 1037, 1051; Mr. McKenna, 1051, 1052; Sir W. Evans Gordon, *Feb. 27,* 1052.

South-Eastern, and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

South Lancashire Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 328.
2R.* *Feb. 27,* 1004.

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 328.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.

South Suburban Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.

Southampton Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Speaker
Amendments, Anticipation of, in debate, out of Order, *Mar. 1,* 1360.
Charges made against Members, *Feb. 23,* 690.
Election of—Appointment of Mr. J. W. Lowther.
Motion, Sir W. Lawson, *Feb. 13* 4–6; Seconder, Mr. S. Wortley, 6–8.
Os. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 8–10; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 10, 11; Mr. A. Douglas, 11; Mr. K. Hardie, 12.
King's Consent and Approval, *Feb. 14* 16.
O. Lord Loreburn, *Feb. 14* 13.
Presentation of, to the House of Lords.
Os. Mr. J. W. Lowther, *Feb. 14* 13; Lord Loreburn, 13.
House of Commons Seats, procedure in securing, by Members, *Feb. 22,* 511.
Interruptions to Debate, *Feb. 21,* 389; *Feb. 22,* 535; *Feb. 26,* 881.
Introduction of Matter outside scope of Debate, *Feb. 23,* 649; *Feb. 28,* 1173; *Mar. 1,* 1372.

[*cont.*

Speaker—*cont.*
- Irrelevant Observations, *Feb. 26*, 860.
- King's Speech—Amendment, Opportunity for discussing, *Feb. 20*, 307.
- Peers, Interference of, at Elections—Case of Lord Atkinson, *Feb. 19*, 104.
- Questions
  - Designation of Members in—Use of Name or Constituency, *Feb. 28*, 1143.
  - Imputations against Members, responsibility for circulating Question containing, etc., *Feb. 28*, 1143, 1144.
  - Irrelevant, etc., *Feb. 21*, 357 ; *Mar. 1*' 1320.
  - Notice to be given of Questions, *Feb. 21*, 352, 355 ; *Feb. 22*, 507.
  - Statements cannot be made during time for, *Mar. 1*, 1301.
- Select Committees, Powers as to issuing interim Reports, *Feb. 28*, 1165.
- Unparliamentary Language, *Feb. 21*, 386.

Stafford
- Charities Appropriated to Elementary Education Purposes — Report Presented; *Feb. 19*, 74, 113.

Standing Orders
- Committees, Appointment of, *Feb. 21*, 359.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 972–981.

Stanmore, Lord
- Africa, South, Government Policy in, *Feb. 27*, 953, 954.
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 955–962.

Stationery and Printing
- County Court Contracts, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 1*, 1317.

Statistical Abstracts
- British Empire, 1890–1904, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 1386.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
- Cattle.
  - Epizootic Abortion, Result of Inquiry into, *Feb. 27*, 1029.
  - Importation Restrictions, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1314.
- Highland Society's Show, Railway Facilities in connection with, *Feb. 28*, 1133.
- Hop Crop Returns—Actual instead of estimated produce, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1132.
- Meat, Price of—Effect of Restrictions on Importation of Cattle, *Feb. 27*, 1008–1110.

Straits Settlements
- Reports Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 79, 116, 117.

Streets
- Stoppages in—Sessional Order renewed, *Feb. 19*, 66.
- Traffic Commission Report, etc.
  - Presented, *Feb. 19*, 77, 78, 109.
  - Proposals as to Adoption of Recommendations in.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Dickson-Poynder ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 801, 802.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Sunderland]
- Equalisation of Rates Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 20*, 258.
- Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 257.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 256.
- Unemployed, Number of, *Feb. 20*, 257, 258.

Sugar
- Beet—Prices (1903–1906).
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beach ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1292, 1293.
- Brussels Convention.
  - Report of Proceedings Presented, *Feb. 19*, 82, 137.
  - Termination, Proposals as to.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Mar. 1*, 1303.

Summary Jurisdiction [Children] Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 28*, 1152.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
- Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 872.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 872.
- Navy Dockyards—Wages, and Conditions of Employment, Grievances as to, *Mar. 1*, 1370.

Sunday Closing [Wales] Act [1881] Amendment Bill
- c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 531

Supply
- Committee of—*Resolution* [Mr. McKenna], *Feb. 26*, 904.
- Irish Estimates, Inadequate Time for Discussion of.
  - *O.* Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19*, 186.
- Procedure as to, Alteration in, proposed.
  - *O.* Sir B. Gurdon, *Feb. 28*, 1183, 1184.

Supreme Courts
- *See under* Law Courts.

Surrey
- Polling Districts, Order Altering Presented, *Feb. 19*, 88, 129.

Sutherland
Postal and Telegraphic Facilities, Extension of, proposed.
O. Mr. Morton, *Feb. 20,* 277, 278.

Sutton, Southcoates and Drypool Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.

Sweden
Magnetic Iron Ore, Proposed Export Duty on.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 21,* 339.

Switzerland
Customs Tariff, New—Translation Presented, *Feb. 19,* 78, 115.
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 70.

Talbot, Mr. J. G. [Oxford University]
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1452.
Voluntary School Premises, Tenure and Trusts of—Return proposed, *Feb. 22,* 492.

Tarporley Light Railway
Order Presented, *Feb. 22,* 455, 489.

Taxation
Ireland—Over-Taxation of, Allegations as to.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Feb. 19,* 185.
Local (Scotland), Inquiry, Result of.
Q. Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb. 26,* 791.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Ecclesiastical Disorders, Royal Commission —Date of Issuing Report, *Feb. 22,* 519.

Taylor, Mr. J. W. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 1426–1428.

Tea
Duty—Budget Proposals
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1,* 1323.

Telegraph Service
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19,* 121.
Inland Written Telegrams—Amended Regulations Presented, *Feb. 19,* 91, 136; *Feb. 26,* 763; *Feb. 27,* 905.
Keadue, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1322, 1323.
Rotherhithe — Discontinuance of Delivery of Telegrams from Dockhead Post Office.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 2,* 1387.

Telegraph and Telephone Services
Accounts Ordered, *Feb. 23,* 622.

Telephone Service
Central Telephone Exchange, Complaints as to Working of.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1261.
London Message Rate Subscription, etc.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1261.
National Telephone Company Employees, Position of—Legislative Proposals.
Qs. Mr. T. W. Wilson, Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Feb. 26,* 786, 787.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 870.
Factory Inspectors
Qualifications of, *Mar. 1,* 1305.
Women, Proposals as to, *Feb. 28,* 1127,
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 870.
Laundries, Unregulated, Number of Persons working in, *Feb. 26,* 780.
Railways—Automatic Brakes, Decision as to, *Feb. 26,* 784.
Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27,* 1107.

Thames
Pollution of Estuary, by Sewage—Proposals as to Prevention.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 22,* 509.

Thames Deep Water Dock (Extension of Time Bill)
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Thames Harbour Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Thibet
See Tibet.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Africa, South—Duty on Imported British Coal, *Mar. 1,* 1282.
Canals Commission, Welsh Representation on, *Feb. 28,* 1130.
Cattle—Epizootic Abortion, Result of Inquiry into, *Feb. 27,* 1028.
Education—Welsh Subjects, Decision as to, *Mar. 1,* 1318.
Emigration and Immigration Returns—Separate Information for Wales, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1130.
Foreign Office Questions, Proposals as to answering, Rule as to Supplementary Question, etc., *Feb. 21,* 340.

[*cont.*

Thomas, Mr. D. A.—*cont.*
Meat, Price of—Effect of Restrictions on Importation of Cattle, *Feb. 27,* 1008.
Naval Manœuvres, Merchant Vessels taking part in, *Feb. 28,* 1122.
Parliaments, British and Foreign—Periods of meeting, *Feb. 27,* 1016.
Redistribution Proposals—Confidential Nature of Committee Report, etc., *Feb. 26,* 787, 788.
Welsh Church Tithes, etc.—Changes occurring since 1894, *Feb. 23,* 623.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
Grazing Land, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 27,* 1030.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894, Amendment Bill, Scope of, *Feb. 27,* 1011.
Police, Metropolitan—Regulation as to Day of Rest, *Feb. 27,* 1011.

Thornton Urban District Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 329.
2R.* *Feb. 26,* 759.

Tibet
Treaty—Progress of Negotiations with China, etc.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Feb. 22,* 503.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Feb. 26,* 775; *Mar. 1,* 1304.

Tobacco
Children, Sale of Cigarettes, etc., to—Legislative Proposals for Prevention.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 27,* 1023.
Ireland, Cultivation in—Extension of Time for Rebate, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28,* 1146.

Tobago
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 68, 116.

Todmorden Corporation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 330.
2R.* *Feb. 26,* 759.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20,* 312; *Feb. 21,* 361.
Navy—Flogging in, *Feb. 20,* 312; *Feb. 21,* 361.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 330.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22,* 595.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22,* 595–599.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R* *Feb. 22,* 525.

Trade, Board of
President—Right Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Disputes
Foreign Contract Labour, Exclusion of, proposed.
Os. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, *Feb. 26,* 851–854, 861, Sir W. Bull, 854, 855; Mr. H. Gladstone, 855–857; Mr. Crooks, 857–861; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 861.
Royal Commission, Report Presented, *Feb. 19,* 83, 109.

Trade Marks Act, 1905
Fees under.
Q. Mr. G. C. Marks; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 26,* 785, 786.

Trade Reports
Annual Series, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69, 120; *Feb. 21,* 332; *Feb. 22,* 454.
Consular, Proposals for increasing Commercial Value of.
O. Mr. Boland, *Feb. 27,* 1068.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Feb. 22,* 504, 505.
Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *Feb. 1,* 70, 120; *Feb. 21,* 332; *Feb. 22,* 454; *Feb. 23,* 622; *Feb. 26,* 703.
Weights and Values, Foreign rendering English Equivalents to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Mar. 1,* 1304.

Trade Unions
Report, etc., Presented, *Feb. 19,* 83, 137; *Feb. 23,* 622; *Feb. 26,* 704.

Trade and Commerce
British Firms with Works in Foreign Countries, Number of, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1,* 1307, 1308.
Foreign New Customs Tariffs, Effect of, on British Trade
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1,* 1308, 1309.
For particular Countries, see their names.
Prosperous Condition of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 23.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19,* 159, 160; Sir H. Vincent, *Feb 20,* 254; Mr. C. Hay *Feb. 26,* 878; Mr. Burns, 887, 896.

[*cont,*

Trade and Commerce—*cont.*
- Statistics as to British Trade, Compilation of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cairns; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 1*, 1309, 1310.

Trade and Navigation
- Accounts (United Kingdom, 1906), Ordered, *Feb. 20*, 211; Presented, *Feb. 21*, 332.

Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Bill
- *c.* 1r.* *Feb. 22*, 524.

Trade Unions and Trade Disputes (No. 2) Bill
- *c.* 1r.* *Feb. 22*, 529.

Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Bill
- Introduction of.
  - References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
    - *Os.* Lord Herschell, *Feb. 19*, 35; Mr. Acland, 148; Mr. K. Hardie, 196.
    - *Q.* Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Mar. 1*, 1305.

Tramways
- Bills—Report ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1114.

Trans-Caucasus
- Agriculture in 1905—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Transvaal
- British Central African Labour, Recruitment of.
  - *Q.* Earl Percy; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1282.
- Chinese Labour.
  - *Os.* Marquess of Ripon, *Feb. 19*, 51–54.
  - Arrivals of Shiploads of Coolies, Information as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 499.
  - Compounds, Decision as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1020, 1021.
  - Conditions of Employment.
    - *Os.* Mr. K. Hardie, *Feb. 19*, 194; 195; Mr. Lupton, *Feb. 20*, 265; Mr. Fell, 278, 279; Mr. C. Wason, 281.
  - Corporal Punishment.
    - "Cangue" Use of.
      - *Q.* Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1116.
    - Head Collars and Stocks, alleged use of.
      - *Q.* Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 500.
    - Milner, Lord, Sanction of.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22*, 499, 500; *Feb. 28*, 1115, 1116

Transvaal—*cont.*
- Chinese Labour—*cont.*
  - Corporal Punishment—*cont.*
    - Regulations, Violations of, etc.
      - *Os.* Dr. Macnamara, *Feb. 20*, 248, 249.
      - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1281.
  - Crimes committed since June, 1905—Return ordered, *Feb. 21*, 333.
  - *Debates* [Commons], *Feb. 22*, 532; *Feb. 23*, 624; [Lords], *Feb. 26*, 716; *Feb. 27*, 908.
    - Chinese first imported into British Possessions by the Radicals, 551.
    - Chinese Ordinance Repeal League, Constitution of, 732, 733.
    - Coalition between the Mining Interest and the Dutch, Possibility of, 985.
    - Colonies, Opinion in, 628, 629, 679, 742, 940.
    - Compound System, Objections to, 536, 728, 937.
    - Conditions of Service, 536, 544, 551, 590, 608, 669, 919, 950, 996, 997.
    - Contract, Terms of, etc., 555, 556, 729, 730, 737, 950.
    - Corporal Punishment, Regulations as to, alleged violation of, 550, 566, 577, 578, 598, 629, 631, 738, 928–933, 941, 976, 977.
      - Milner, Lord, Sanction of, 930, 931, 941, 962.
    - Desertions from the Mines, 631.
    - Financial Aspect of the Question, 661, 662, 971, 972.
    - Free Churches, Opinion of, 577, 654.
    - "Freedom," meaning of the Term, 991, 992, 1002.
    - "Gangs," Objections to Monitorial System, etc., 565.
    - Immigration Ordinances issued in last fifty years, Provisions of, 955–962.
    - Inquiry into system of, proposed, 543, 544, 553, 578, 649, 694, 721, 731, 739, 972.
    - Interference of the Imperial Government, Policy of, 549, 562, 563, 920.
    - Licences
      - Number issued, 558.
      - Revocation of outstanding Licences, Possibility of, 558, 559, 674.
      - Suspension of, 674, 942.
    - Limitation of Numbers, Policy of, 742–745.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
- Chinese Labour—*cont.*
  - *Debates—cont.*
    - Machinery and Labour-saving Appliances, use of, 562, 642.
    - Mining Industry dependent on abundant Labour Supply, 553, 563, 638, 648, 658, 680, 909, 918.
    - Natives
      - Compulsory Laws, Dangers of, 975.
      - Lack of, 545, 546, 665, 919, 1001.
      - Sources of Supply, 639.
    - Native Police, Information as to, 538.
    - Necessity for the Introduction, 716, 717, 734, 756, 913, 918, 936, 949, 963, 964, 982, 983.
    - Number of Coolies in South Africa in January, 1906, 535.
    - Ordinance
      - Amendments to, submitted to Mining Magnates, alleged, 689–691.
      - Comparison of, with other Ordinances issued in last fifty years, 955–962.
      - Continuing in Force pending Decision of the Transvaal Government, 547, 548, 561, 579, 610, 637, 675, 740, 741, 914, 991, 992.
      - Immediate Repeal of, Impossibility of, 559, 560, 563, 574, 575, 597, 609, 636, 658, 671–673, 691–693, 738.
    - "Party cry," Policy of, 539, 547, 595, 606, 625, 650, 682, 724–726, 909, 937.
    - Petitions from Labourers, Method of dealing with, etc., 537, 538.
    - Policy of the Government, 571, 572, 574, 575, 579–581, 601, 602, 607, 611, 633–636, 645, 646, 658, 673–678, 687–694, 751–756, 935, 936, 942, 990.
    - Property, Right to hold, Question as to, 584, 730.
    - Public Opinion in South Africa, 550, 557, 576, 626, 627, 636, 653, 654, 741, 742.
    - Punitive Regulations, Alteration in, 565, 566.
    - Racial Aspect of the Question, 669.
    - Recruiting Methods, 657.
    - e-enlistment, Prohibition of, proposed, 581, 604, 633, 675, 676.

Transvaal—*cont*
- Chinese Labour—*cont.*
  - *Debates—cont.*
    - Re-introduction of System by the Transvaal Government, Question of Exercising Imperial Veto, etc., 580–582, 603, 610, 676, 677, 687, 741, 753, 754, 991, 992, 1000, 1002.
    - Repatriation, Provision as to, 540, 567, 568, 604, 729, 738.
      - Cost of, to be defrayed from Public Funds, 540, 541, 569, 575, 604, 633, 646–648, 674, 688, 733, 740, 751, 936, 942, 965, 966, 992, 997.
      - Mine-Owners, Placing Cost of, on, 614.
    - Responsibility for the System, 556, 557, 573, 645, 716.
    - Shares, Depreciation of, since the Return of the Liberal Government, 969.
    - Shareholders, Position of, 967–970, 1000, 1001.
    - Skilled Labour, Employment of the Chinese on, 666, 667.
    - "Slavery," Allegations as to, and Imputations against the Unionist Government, 532–536, 542–544, 547, 572, 573, 576, 578, 584–586, 588–596, 600, 608, 611–613, 615–620, 631, 632, 642, 665, 667, 668, 681–686, 693, 694, 721, 728, 735–737, 750, 909–912, 934, 935, 948, 951, 952, 959, 963, 972–974, 988, 996, 998.
      - Definition of, 547, 596, 615, 652.
      - Misrepresentations and Political Cartoons, 533, 534, 542, 543, 547, 551, 552, 585, 586, 588, 591, 592, 594, 595, 599, 600, 603, 616–619, 655, 682–686, 735, 736, 750, 909, 926, 934, 938, 951, 952, 973, 974.
    - Temporary and Experimental Nature of the Scheme, 742–745, 984, 990, 998.
    - Trade, and Labour Market of Great Britain, Effect of Stoppage of Mines on, 970.
    - Trials, new Regulations as to, 566, 739, 941, 942.
    - Unionist Party, Attitude towards, 554.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Wages
Deductions from, Objections, Abolition of System of, 564, 565, 578.
Lowering of, at the Root of the Matter, alleged, 661, 662, 679.
Rate of, 927, 978.
White Labour
Creswell, Mr., Experiments by, 732.
Increase in Number of, due to Importation of the Chinese, 548, 641, 642.
Physical Disabilities of, 651, 660, 679.
Wages, Rate Required by, 718, 928.
Wives, Facilities for Importation of, 983.
Working Classes, Attitude of, 656, 659, 662, 664, 678.
Importation, Decision as to Continuing.
Q. Mr. Fullerton ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1283.
Letter to Earl of Selborne dated 5th January, Reply to.
Q. Mr. E. Dunn ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1284, 1285.
Licences
Number issued.
Os. Mr. Walsh, *Feb. 20,* 250, 251.
Suspension of issue of
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19,* 27, 28 ; Marquess of Ripon, 54;; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19,* 155 ; Mr. C. Wason, *Feb. 20,* 282, 283.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 22.
Lyttelton's, Mr., Telegram, of 27th October, Effect of, on Issue of Licences.
Q. Mr. Walsh ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1285, 1286.
Native Labour Supply, Question of.
Os. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Feb. 20,* 224, 225 ; Major Seely, 226.
Ordinance, Amendments, Proposals as to.
Q. Col. Legge;; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28,* 1115.
Application to all Chinese Coolies.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1281.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour—*cont.*
Pless, Mr., proposed Criminal Proceedings against — Date of Despatch of Telegram.
Qs. Mr. Bridgeman ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 23,* 623, 624 ; *Mar. 1,* 1278, 1279.
Political Cartoons and Misrepresentations.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19,* 156–158 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 170 ; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *Feb. 20,* 223 ; Major Seely, 226 ; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 226 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 233, 234 ; Dr. Macnamara, 247. 248 ; Mr. C. Wason, 282 ; Mr. Bottomley, 294.
Re-enlistment of Coolies, Amendment of Clause relating to, proposed.
Os. Dr. Macnamara, *Feb. 20,* 247 ; Mr. Walsh, 250, 252, 253.
Q. Dr. Macnamara ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22,* 498.
Regulations, revised, Tabling proposed.
Q. Mr. S. Poberts ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22,* 499.
Repatriation Proposals.
Q. Mr. Bottomley ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1284.
Correspondence relating to, Tabling, proposed.
Q. Mr. Brotherton ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28,* 1123.
Cost of, to be defrayed from Imperial Funds.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 19,* 172, 173 ; Mr. K. Hardie, 195 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Feb. 20,* 232 ; Dr. Macnamara, 247 ; Mr. Walsh, 253 ; Mr. C. Wason, 284 ; Mr Bottomley, 295.
Incidence of Payment for.
Qs. Mr. Dalziel ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22,* 500, 501.
Notice required for obtaining Leave.
Q. Col. Legge ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27,* 1020.
Sum allocated for, Date of Presentation of Estimate, etc.
Q. Lord Balcarres ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 23,* 623.
Responsibility for the Scheme.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *Feb. 20,* 283.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour—*cont.*
"Slavery," Allegations as to.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Feb. 19*, 41; Marquess of Ripon, 53; Marquess of Salisbury, 62, 63, 65; Earl of Crewe, 64, 65; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 156–159; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 170, 171; Mr. Paul, 201; Major Seely, *Feb. 20*, 227–230; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 231–234; Dr. Macnamara, 248, 249; Mr. P. Pease, 273; Mr. Morton, 275; Mr. Fell, 278.
Commission of Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*, 159; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Feb. 20*, 233; Mr. Walsh, 252; Mr. Bottomley, 295.
Trials—Use of Chinese Language, etc.
Q. Mr. Bottomley, *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 26*, 772.
Garrison, Proposals as to Retention of.
Q. Mr. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1117.
Indian Coolie Labour for, Conditions of
Q Mr. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1126.
Mines
Gold Output, Statistics as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1021, 1022.
Labour in (*see also subheadings* Chinese Labour, Native Labour, White Labour, etc.)
Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 82, 117, 131.
Native Labour
Effect of Work in the Mines on Kaffirs.
Os. Mr. J. M. Robertson, *Feb. 28*, 1220, 1221; Sir G. Parker, 1227.
Kaffir Compounds, Proposals for Improving.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner: *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1121.
Statistics as to Kaffirs employed in Mines.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Belloc; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1018, 1019.
Native Races
Protection of, under the New Constitution.
Os. Mr. Byles, *Feb. 28*, 1212–1214; Sir B. Gurdon, 1214–1216; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 1216–1224; Mr. Wedgwood, 1224–1226; Sir G. Parker, 1226–1231; Mr. Churchill, 1231–1244; Mr. Wyndham, 1244–1247.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Native Races—*cont.*
Treatment of by the Boers, and the White Population.
Os. Mr. J. M. Robertson, *Feb. 28*, 1216–1224; Mr. Wedgwood, 1224–1226.
Parliamentary Elections, Date of.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1020.
Policy of the Government—Attack on by Colonel W. T. F. Davies, at Imperial Light Horse Dinner.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1015.
Qs. Mr. B. Roberts; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28*, 1124, 1125.
Political and Industrial Situation in.
Os. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 715, 716, 719.
Population, Statistics as to.
Qs. Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 27*, 1021.
Self-Government, Proposals as to.
Os. Marquess of Northampton, *Feb. 19*, 27; Marquess of Lansdowne, 42; Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*, 154; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 167; Mr. J. K. Hardie, 199; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Feb. 20*, 235; Mr. B. Roberts, 270; Lord Loreburn, *Feb. 27*, 943–946; Earl of Halsbury, 947; Marquess of Lansdowne, 986; Earl of Crewe, 994, 1003.
Constitution
Opportunity for Discussion of.
O. Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 720; Earl of Elgin, 746; Marquess of Lansdowne, 988.
Terms of.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Feb. 19*, 42, 43, 54; Marquess of Ripon, 54–56; Mr. Dickinson, 144; Mr. Acland, 146; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 155; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 168–170; Viscount Milner, *Feb. 26*, 720; Earl of Elgin, 745, 746; Duke of Marlborough, 748, 749; Lord Burghclere, *Feb. 27*, 908, 914; Marquess of Lansdowne, 987.
Franchise, Conditions of
Os. Earl Roberts *Feb. 27*, 917; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 984, 985; Earl of Crewe, 996.
Letters Patent granted by Mr. Lyttelton, Terms of.
O. Lord Loreburn, *Feb. 27*, 943 944; Earl of Crewe, 994, 995.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Self-Government, Proposals as to—*cont.*
Local Demand, Publication of Papers s Evidence of.
Q. Earl Percy; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1281, 1282.
Native Races, Protection of.
Os. Mr. Byles, *Feb. 28,* 1212–1214; Sir B. Gurdon, 1214–1216; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 1216–1224; Mr. Wedgewood, 1224–1226; Sir G. Parker, 1226–1231; Mr. Churchill, 1231–1244; Mr. Wyndham, 1244–1247.
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19,* 22.
Volunteer Forces, Power of raising.
Qs. Mr. S. Wilson, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 28,* 1123, 1124.
War Contribution Loan
Payment of, Proposals of the Government as to enforcing, etc.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 21,* 338.
Qs. Mr. Dalziel; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Feb. 22,* 501.
White Labour, Condition of, Effect of stoppage of Chinese Labour, etc.
Q. Mr. Fiennes; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1283.
Q. Mr. E. Dunn; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1,* 1284.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Mar. 1,* 1323.

Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 22,* 530.

Trawling
Bantry Bay, Restrictions in.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1273.
Firth of Forth, Prohibition of Illegal Trawling in.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Feb. 26,* 790, 791.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman

Treasury Chest
Accounts Presented, *Feb. 19,* 123.

Trent Navigation Company Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Trim
District Schools—Local Government Board Order Presented, *Feb. 22,* 456, 488.

Trinidad
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 68, 116.

Truck Acts
Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc.—Motion [Sir C. Dilke] *Feb. 27,* 1076.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, 1076, 1109; Mr. Shackleton, 1083; Mr. Bell, 1084, 1098; Mr. J. H. Wilson, 1087; Mr. Fenwick, 1087; Mr. Seddon, 1080; Mr. S. Evans, 1091; Mr. H. Samuel, 1093; Sir E. Clarke, 1101; Mr. H. Gladstone, 1103; Mr. K. Hardie, 1104; Mr. J. Johnson, 1105; Mr. Cremer, 1106; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 1107; Mr. R. Duncan, 1108.

Truro Gas Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 702.

Trustee Savings Banks
National Debt—Annual Account Presented, *Mar. 1,* 1250.
Report Presented, *Feb. 26,* 705, 760.

Tuberculosis
Animals affected by
Bovine Tuberculosis Commission Report, Date of Issue of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 20,* 214.
Compulsory Slaughter, Compensation for.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Feb. 20,* 212, 213.

Tuberculosis [Animals] Prevention and Compensation Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 805.

Tunis
Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Turkey
Affairs of South Eastern Europe—Correspondence Presented, *Feb. 19,* 77, 119.
Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 69.

Turks and Caicos Island
Prison—Rules Presented, *Feb. 19,* 131; *Feb. 22,* 455.
Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 116.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
Army—Regimental Marches through Agricultural Districts, Effect of, *Mar. 1,* 1298.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*First Lord of the Admiralty*
Foreign Seamen on British Ships—Inclusion of Legislation as to, in Merchant Shipping Bill, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 1257.

Twelve o'Clock Rule
Suspension of.
Resolution (Mr. Asquith), *Feb. 26,* 806.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 330.

Tyne
"Satellite," H.M.S., Decision as to.
Q. Mr. H. J. Craig; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Feb. 27*, 1009, 1010.

Uganda
Game Preservation in.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 1*, 1297, 1298.

Railway, Working of—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 76, 117.

Report, Annual, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 68, 116.

Unemployed
Defensive Tariff as a Remedy.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 879, 880; Mr. Hunt, 900, 901.

Distress Committees, Grant of Money to, from Treasury, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Feb. 22*, 490.

Farm Colonies—Attitude of the Local Government Board towards
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 882; Mr. Burns, 891–895, 898.

Legislation dealing with, Omission of.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 876–883; Mr. Burns, 894.

Number of—Pauperism Returns, etc.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *Feb. 20*, 254, 258; Mr. Stuart, 257, 258; Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 878; Mr. Burns, 887, 893.

Relief Works, etc.—Attitude of the Local Government Board towards.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 880–883; Mr. Burns, 890.

Return, Statistics contained in.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 877, 878; Mr. Burns, 887.

Statistics as to Skilled and Unskilled Labourers Unemployed.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 21*, 345, 346.

Wages, Rate of
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 881; Mr. Burns, 890.

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905
Regulations made under—Presented, *Feb. 26*, 704, 762.

Unemployed Workmen Act Amendment Bill
Introduction of
References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Mr. J. K. Hardie, 198; Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 880; Mr. G. H. Roberts, 884.

Union of Benefices Metropolis Act, 1860
Schemes Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95, 139.

United States of America
Coal Industry—Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 22*, 454.

Convention as to Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction in Zanzibar, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 118.

St. Louis Exhibition—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 80, 110.

Trade Reports, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 69, 70.

Universities
Oxford, *see that title.*

Scotland—Ordinances of Court Presented, *Feb. 19*, 95.

University Colleges
Grants to, in England and Wales.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 26*, 776, 777.

Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 75, 112.

Uruguay
Trade Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.

Uxbridge Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 330.

Vagrancy
Departmental Committee Report Presented, *Feb. 26*, 703, 762.

Vagrants
Increase in Number of.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 877; Mr. Burns, 888.

Valentia, Lord [Oxford]
Postage on Literature for the Blind *Mar. 1*, 1311.

Vauclain's Patent Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Verulam, Earl of
Manuscripts of—Report Presented, *Feb. 19*, 81, 108.

Victoria & Albert Museum
Report Presented, *Feb. 27*, 905, 1005.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Army
Ordnance Contracts, Allocation of, *Feb. 28*, 1116.

Training—Col. Pollock's Scheme, Army Council Attitude towards, *Feb. 22*, 490.

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1444.

Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20*, 253–256.

Foreign Vessels in British Ports, Application of Statutory Requirements to, *Feb. 26*, 783.

German New Customs Tariff, Effect of, etc., *Feb. 21*, 344, 345; *Feb. 28*, 1117.

[*cont.*

Vincent, Col. C. E. H.—*cont.*
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 253.
  Navy Contracts—Alterations in Specifications, *Feb. 21*, 336.
  Newfoundland Fisheries — Indemnity, Question of defraying out of Imperial Funds, *Feb. 27*, 1074.
  Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1195.
  Russian Customs Tariff, New, Effect of, *Feb. 26*, 781; *Feb. 28*, 1118.
  Trade and Commerce
    British Firms with Works in Foreign Countries, *Mar. 1*, 1307.
    Foreign New Customs Tariffs, Effect of, on British Trade, etc., *Mar. 1*, 1308, 1309.
  Unemployed—Statistics as to Skilled and Unskilled Labour, *Feb. 21*, 345, 346.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1319.
  Redistribution Committee, Information a to, *Feb. 27*, 1041.

Volunteers
  Proposals of the Government as to.
    Q. Sir C. McLaren ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 334.
  Uniform Contracts, Responsibility for alleged Sweating of Workers, Case of Mrs. Thorogood, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Seaverns, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Crooks ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Feb. 21*, 336, 337.

Voters' Lists
  Expenses—Alteration of Law proposed by Wexford County Council.
    Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 28*, 1145.

Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 531.
  2R., *Feb. 27*, 1109.

Wages Boards Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 22*, 529

Waleran of Uffculme, Baron
  Introduced in House of Lords, *Feb. 19*, 24.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill
  l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Wallis Divorce Bill
  l. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 1249.

Walrond, Mr. L. [Devon, Tiverton]
  Guiana, British — Repatriation of Coolies, *Feb. 28*, 1148.

Walsh, Mr. S. [Lancashire, S.W., Ince]
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 250.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20*, 250–253.
    Lyttelton's, Mr., Telegram of 27th October, Effect of, *Mar. 1*, 1285.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
  Criminal Law Procedure, Legislative Proposals for Amending, *Mar. 1*, 1291.
  Merchant Shipping—Legislative Measures, *Feb. 19*, 140.
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, Proposals as to, *Mar. 1*, 1319.
  Westbury Division of Wilts, Objections to Issue of New Writ for, *Feb. 19*, 100.

Wandsworth and Putney Gas Removal of Sulphur (Restrictions) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Feb. 21*, 330.

War Office
  Secretary of State—Right Hon. R. B. Haldane.
  Parliamentary Under-Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
  Fingringhoe, Purchase of Land at.
    Q. Mr. A. L. Lever ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 1*, 1290.

Warboys Union of Districts Drainage Bill
  l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
  Education Grant, Period for Payment of, *Feb. 22*, 509.
  King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 23*, 650.
  Portsmouth Dockyards, Alterations to—Payment of Trade Union Rate of Wages, *Mar. 1*, 1382.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 23*, 659.
  Unemployed Distress Committees, Treasury Grant to, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 490.
  Works, Public, Housing Accommodation for Men employed on, *Feb. 28*, 1130.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Church Rates, Abolition of, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 1320.
House of Commons Seats, Procedure in securing, by Members, *Feb. 22,* 511.
Public Accounts Committee Reports, Opportunity for discussing, *Mar 1,* 1298.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Crofters and Fishermen, Provision of land for, *Feb. 20,* 285, 286.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20,* 280.
Old Age Pensions, Question of, *Feb. 20,* 284 ; *Feb. 28,* 1147.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 20,* 281–284.

Water Supply Bills
Report Ordered, *Feb. 28,* 1114.

Waterford
Epizootic Lymphangitis Outbreak, Claim in connection with.
Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1267.
Evicted Tenants, Reinstatements of.
Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1,* 1272, 1273.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 330.

Watford Gas Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 331.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 331.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
Fishery Board, Constitution of, *Feb. 26.* 792.

Ways and Means
Committee for—Resolution (Mr. McKenna) *Feb. 26,* 904.

Weardale of Stanhope, Baron
Introduced in House of Lords, *Feb. 19,* 24.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
Africa, South—Native Races, Protection of, under the new Constitution, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1224–1226.

Wei-hai-Wei
Status of, and Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Norman ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Feb. 22,* 505.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Crofters' Holdings Amendment Bill, Introduction of, *Feb. 20,* 268, 269.

Wells, Dean and Chapter of
Calendar of Manuscripts, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 81, 108.

Welsh Church
Disestablishment of.
O. Mr. E. Griffith, *Feb. 20,* 238, 239.
Tithes, etc., Changes occurring since 1894.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. H. Gladstone, *Feb. 23,* 623.

West Indies
Inter-Colonial Sanitary Convention, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 79, 117.

West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 331.

West Middlesex Roads Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 331.
2R.* *Feb. 27,* 1004.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill
l. 1R.* *Feb. 26,* 701.

Wexford
Jurors' and Voters' Lists Expenses—Alteration of Law, proposed, *Feb. 28,* 1145.
Post Office—Private Bags, Charge for.
Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 1,* 1322.

White, Mr. L. [Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose]
Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26,* 864, 865.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26,* 864.

White Slave Traffic
International Agreement, for Suppression of, Presented, *Feb. 19,* 67, 118.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Redistribution Commission, Information as to, *Feb. 27,* 1044.
Voting Disqualification (Poor Law) Removal Bill, 2R., *Feb. 27,* 1110.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley]
Fiscal Policy, *Feb. 20,* 274.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20,* 273.
Liquor Traffic—Legislative Proposals, Absence of, *Feb. 20,* 274.

Wicklow, Earl
Representative Peer for Ireland, Election as, *Feb. 14,* 14.

Wigan and Heysham Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Feb. 21,* 331.
2R.* *Feb. 26,* 759.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]

Post Office Grievances, Inquiry into—Selection of Witnesses, *Mar. 1*, 1293.

Wilkie, Mr. A. [Dundee]

Poor Law—Commission of Inquiry, Constitution of, *Feb. 28*, 1202–1205.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness]

Coasts, Erosion of, *Feb. 26*, 862–864.

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 26*, 862.

Merchant Shipping Amendment Act, Proposals as to, *Feb. 27*, 1028.

Navy—Dockyard Discharges—Re-employment of Men, *Feb. 27*, 1017.

Parliamentary Procedure, Proposals as to Revision of, *Feb. 27*, 1034.

Transvaal

Garrison, Decision as to, *Feb. 28*, 1117.

Self-Government Proposals—Power of raising Volunteer Forces, *Feb. 28*, 1123, 1124.

Wilson, Mr. J. H. [Middlesbrough]

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 20*, 287.

Merchant Shipping

Continuous Discharge Certificates, Objections to System of, *Feb. 20*, 288, 289.

Cooks, Certification of, proposed, *Feb. 20*, 288.

Food Scale, Enforcing Recommendations of Committee, proposed, *Feb. 20*, 287, 288.

Foreign Seamen on British Ships, *Feb. 20*, 289–292.

Legislative Proposals, *Feb. 20*, 287.

"Ordovician," Loss of, Due to Employment of Foreign Seamen, Alleged, *Feb. 22*, 507, 508.

Workmen's Compensation Act, Extension of to Seamen, *Feb. 20*, 292, 293.

Truck Acts, Amendment of, Hardships involved by Present System, etc., *Feb. 27*, 1087.

Wilson, Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 1390–1393.

National Telephone Company Employees, Position of, *Feb. 26*, 786.

Wiltshire

Parliamentary Election for Westbury Division

New Member Sworn, *Feb. 27*, 1035.

New Writ, Objections to Issue of.
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Feb. 19*, 97–100; Sir J. L. Walton, 100; Sir E. Carson, 101; Mr. H. Gladstone, 101; Sir W. Robson, 102.

Winchester, Marquess of

Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 27*, 963–967.

Wines

Basis Wines, Proposals as to Taxing.
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Feb. 28*, 1147.

Imported—Return as to Quantities (1905) Ordered, *Feb. 28*, 1248.

Winterstoke, Lord

Introduced to the House of Lords, *Feb. 14*, 15.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill

c. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 805.
2R., *Feb. 28*, 1210.
Com., Mar. 1, 1383.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 702.

Withington

Postmen's Pay, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Mar. 1*, 1313.

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill

l. 1R.* *Feb. 26*, 701.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]

Divisions, Amendment of System of Taking, proposed, *Feb. 22*, 519.

Judge-Advocate General—Terms and Conditions of Appointment, *Feb. 22*, 492.

Woods, Forests, &c.

Accounts Presented, *Feb. 20*, 210.

Woodville

Police, Extra, Reason for and Cost of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Mar. 1*, 1263.

Workhouses

Dublin, North, Infantile Mortality in.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *Feb. 22*, 517.

Working Classes

Condition of, Causes of, etc.
Os .Mr. J. K. Hardie, *Feb. 19*, 200; Mr. Bottomley, *Feb. 20*, 298; Earl of Granard, *Feb. 22*, 467.

Old Age Pensions, *see that title.*

Wages

Board of Trade Census,
Os. Earl of Granard, *Feb. 22*, 467; Earl of Crewe, 482.

Statistics as to.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *Feb. 26*, 878.

Workmen's Compensation

Insurance, Question of.
O. Mr. Barnes, *Feb. 20*, 260.

Out-workers, Position of.
Os. Mr. Barnes, *Feb. 20*, 260.

Schemes—Report (1905) Presented, *Feb. 23*, 622; *Feb. 26*, 704.

Workmen's Compensation Acts

Proceedings under—Statistics Presented, *Feb. 19*, 74, 109.

Seamen, Extension to, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. H. Wilson, *Feb. 20*, 292, 293.

Workmen's Compensation Acts Amendment Bill

Introduction of

References to, in the King's Speech, *Feb. 19*, 24.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *Feb. 19*, 139; Mr. Acland, 148; Mr. Barnes, *Feb. 20*, 259.

Works, Board of

Ireland—Case of Mr. R. McConkey, Reason for Non-award of Pension, etc.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Feb. 26*, 766.

Works, Public

Housing Accommodation for Men Employed on.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Feb. 28*, 1130, 1131.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]

Hammersmith Exhibition—Conditions of Leasing Land, etc., *Feb. 26*, 789.

Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1165–1167, 1193.

Speaker, Election of, *Feb. 13*, 6–8.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]

Africa, South—Natives, Protection of, under the New Constitution, *Feb. 28*, 1244–1247.

King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Feb. 22*, 572.

Non-provided Schools—Information given in Return, *Feb. 28*, 1133.

Procedure, Rules of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *Feb. 28*, 1158.

Transvaal—Chinese Labour Question, *Feb. 22*, 572–580.

Zanzibar

Convention as to Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 67, 118.

Trade Report, Presented, *Feb. 19*, 70.